HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XLIX APRIL, 1956 NUMBER 2

THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE PAULINE COLLECTION

JACK FINEGAN
PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

THROUGH publication in The Interpreter's Bible the theory is being given wide currency that Paul's collected letters were published originally in the form of two papyrus rolls, the first containing Ephesians and I and II Corinthians, the second comprising Romans, I and II Thessalonians, Galatians, Colossians-Philemon, and Philippians.[1]

It is of course to be agreed that Paul's letters were collected, since they exist as a collection in the New Testament canon. It is also almost certain that the original collection was made before A.D. 95. At that time Clement of Rome wrote to the Corinthians and virtually quoted from Romans (Rom. 1:29–32 — I Clem. 35:5–6) and I Corinthians (I Cor. 1:11–13 — I Clem. 47:1–3; I Cor. 12:12–26 — I Clem. 37:5; I Cor. 13:4–7 — I Clem. 49:5), as well as made probable allusions to passages in II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians. Since he prefaced his citation of I Corinthians 1:11–13 by saying, "Take up the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul" (I Clem. 47:1), it seems evident that he had a copy of that letter in Rome and therefore probably also had copies of the other letters, in other words already possessed the Pauline collection.

Likewise Ignatius (A.D. 107–117) was not only acquainted with Romans, I Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians, and probably also II Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and I Thessalonians, but in writing to the Ephesians (12:2) explicitly spoke of what Paul said "in every letter" (ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ). Like the reference in II Peter 3:16 to what Paul wrote "in all his letters"

[1] John Knox in The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press), IX (1954), pp. 357 f.

(ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς), this can hardly mean anything other than that Paul's collected letters were a known entity.

Polycarp, too, was acquainted with Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and II Thessalonians, and spoke of the "letters" (3:2) of Paul. Writing to the Philippians soon after Ignatius had left them, Polycarp forwarded collected letters of Ignatius, an instructive analogy to the bringing together of the Pauline letters (13:2).

But is the assumption correct that a collection of the letters of Paul, made presumably in the last quarter of the first century A.D., would have been put on two papyrus rolls? Whether the material was papyrus or parchment, both of which were available and in use at the time, is immaterial; but whether the form was the roll or something else has a bearing upon a conception of how the collection was arranged.

The roll was indeed the prevailing form for the Jewish scriptures and other writings, as shown afresh by the Dead Sea scrolls; and also for the works of literature in the pagan world. According to a recent enumeration, 476 second-century non-Christian literary papyrus manuscripts have been found in Egypt and of these 465 or more than 97 per cent are in the form of the roll.[2] Among New Testament writings, the Fourth Gospel and the Revelation of John each speaks of itself as a βιβλίον (Jn. 20:30; Rev. 22:18f.), while Revelation 6:14 confirms the otherwise widely known use of this word to mean roll or scroll. In Latin the word for the same kind of book was *volumen*, from the verb *volvere*, "to roll."

The other form of book which must be considered was the codex. Latin *caudex* or *codex* meant first the trunk of a tree, then a block of wood cut into leaves and fastened together, and finally any leaf book of papyrus, parchment, or other material. Wooden tablets (*tabellae*), plain or covered with wax, were familiar as a writing material in Rome from very early times; extant examples from Pompeii bear dates corresponding to A.D. 53 and 55.[3] When several were bound together a convenient note-

[2] C. H. Roberts, "The Codex," in Proceedings of the British Academy, 40 (1954), p. 184; cf. C. C. McCown, "The Earliest Christian Books," in The Biblical Archaeologist, VI, 2, May 1943, p. 27.

[3] David Diringer, The Hand-Produced Book (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), p. 33.

book was produced which was commonly called a *pugillaris* (sc. *libellus*), literally a "fist book," or a handbook. From this point it was an easy step to employ leaves of papyrus or parchment instead of wood, and when this was done the flexibility and utility of the codex form of book were greatly improved. If a stack of sheets of papyrus or parchment was folded over once a codex was made which consisted of a single quire. If several sheets were folded into a group, and a number of such groups were placed together, a multiple quire book was formed.

It is known that the codex was in use at the time when Paul's letters are supposed to have been collected. In about A.D. 85 the Latin writer Martial composed a number of verses to accompany presents such as the Romans gave to their friends at the Saturnalia. Found in Book XIV of his Epigrams, these poems contain references to pocket editions in the form of parchment (Latin *membrana*) codices of Homer, Virgil, Cicero, and Livy. Concerning a parchment codex edition of Virgil (Vergilius in membranis), Martial remarks on how much such a small parchment book would hold (XIV, 186). Similarly he recommends a sort of pocket edition parchment codex of Cicero (Cicero in membranis) as a handy traveling companion (XIV, 188).[4]

While the codex was thus coming at least gradually into use at this time for pagan literature, there is much recent evidence for the fact that this form of book was specially favored and used in Christian circles from a very early date. From the second century, when 97 per cent of the non-Christian literary papyri were in the roll form, we now have eight Christian biblical papyri and all of these are in the form of the codex. In the entire period extending to shortly after the end of the fourth century, we have 111 biblical manuscripts or fragments from Egypt, of which 99 are codices. A list of the very oldest and most important copies of New Testament books includes the following items, all of which are books or portions thereof in codex form: P^{52}, at present the oldest known manuscript of any part of the New Testament, is a fragment of the Gospel according to John from a codex be-

[4] In itself the word *membrana* simply means skin prepared for writing, or parchment, and it can be used of parchment rolls, but in most cases where it appears in classical Latin it is in a context which requires or permits the meaning of notebook or codex. Roberts, op. cit., p. 174.

lieved to date from the first half of the second century. P^{46}, the oldest manuscript of any considerable portion of the New Testament, is a codex of the letters of Paul probably not later than A.D. 200. P^{45} is a codex which contained the four gospels and Acts, early third century in date. P^{47}, with Revelation 9–17, is a third century codex. All of these are papyrus books; from the middle of the fourth century onward we have the great parchment manuscripts in the same form, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and so on. Since the examples we are fortunate enough to have will hardly have been the first of their kind, we may readily assume the use of the codex for Christian books already in the first century. As a matter of fact, a reasonable theory to account for the probable loss of the original ending of the Gospel according to Mark is that that book was published at the outset in a codex: in a codex the last leaf is most likely to suffer damage; in a roll the destruction is most apt to be at the beginning.[5]

Therefore, since the codex form of book was available in the first century A.D., since extant examples show that it was in use for Christian books and collections of books from the second century and probably earlier, and since it was immensely preferable to the roll for any book or group of books which it was desired to consult frequently, every probability speaks for the conclusion that Paul's collected letters were published originally in a codex rather than a roll.[6]

Now, what evidence is there for the order in which the individual letters of Paul were arranged in this hypothetical original codex?

The oldest list of New Testament books we know about was that of Marcion, the ship owner from Sinope who was expelled from the church at Rome about A.D. 144.[7] As is well known,

[5] For the evidence of the Christian manuscripts, see Roberts, op. cit., pp. 185–191; C. C. McCown, "Codex and Roll in the New Testament," in Harvard Theological Review, 34 (1941), pp. 219–250.

[6] The same conclusion is now reached by G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles (London: The British Academy, 1953), p. 15.

[7] The Marcionites said that Christ came in the fifteenth year of Tiberius and that Marcion came 115 years and six and one-half months later (Tertullian, Against Marcion I, 19), a date which it may be assumed was that of Marcion's expulsion from the Christian community of Rome and consequent formation of his own church.

Marcion's canon consisted of the Gospel according to Luke and letters of Paul, which writings he edited freely in the interest of his own doctrines or, as Irenaeus said, "mutilated." [8] Around A.D. 200, Tertullian wrote a long treatise Against Marcion, in the fifth book of which he discussed Marcion's treatment of Paul's letters. Since Tertullian takes up these letters very systematically, one after the other, it may be assumed that he is following the order in which they stood in the Marcionite canon. This order is: Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Laodiceans (= Ephesians), Colossians, Philippians, Philemon. Tertullian states (Against Marcion V, xvii) that the letter which Marcion called Laodiceans was actually Ephesians, and gives many quotations from it which show that he was indeed referring to the canonical letter. Epiphanius (d. A.D. 403) also attests the same order of Paul's letters in Marcion's canon, except that he puts Philippians last.

In the sixth century Codex Fuldensis and in many other later manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, Latin prologues are prefixed to Paul's letters. In their opposition to Judaism and advocacy of Pauline Christianity, these prologues are in striking agreement with the position of Marcion. It is generally accepted that they were composed if not by Marcion at least by his followers, originally in Greek, and in the second century. The prologue to Romans, for example, runs as follows:

AD ROMANOS

Romani sunt in partibus Italiae. Hi praeventi sunt a falsis apostolis et sub nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi in legem et prophetas erant inducti. Hos revocat apostolus ad veram evangelicam fidem scribens eis a Corintho.

TO THE ROMANS

Romans are in the parts of Italy. These were reached beforehand by false apostles, and under the name of our Lord Jesus Christ had been brought into the law and the prophets. These the apostle recalls to the true evangelical faith, writing to them from Corinth.

[8] Against Heresies I, xxvii, 2. Cf. Tertullian, On Prescription against Heretics 38: "Marcion expressly and openly used the knife, not the pen, since he made such an excision of the Scriptures as suited his own subject matter."

There are such prologues for Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. Presumably there was also once a prologue of the same sort for "Laodiceans," but this has now been replaced by a prologue to Ephesians which is evidently of later composition. Also later and of a different construction from the others are prologues which have been added for II Corinthians, II Thessalonians, I Timothy, II Timothy, and Titus.[9]

The existence of these prologues, therefore, confirms the accuracy of Tertullian's list of the letters of Paul as they stood in the canon of Marcion, at about the middle of the second century A.D.[10] Marcion's list is reproduced in column 1 of Table 1.

TABLE 1

1. Marcion A.D. 144	2. P^{46} A.D. 200	3. B A.D. 350	4. S A.D. 350
Gal	Rom	Rom	Rom
Cor	Heb	I Cor	I Cor
Rom	I Cor	II Cor	II Cor
Thess	II Cor	Gal	Gal
Laod (= Eph)	Eph	[Heb]	Eph
Col	Gal	Eph	Phil
Phil	Phil	Phil	Col
Phm	Col	Col	I Thess
	I Thess	I Thess	II Thess
	II Thess (?)	II Thess	Heb
	Phm (?)	Heb . . .	I Tim
			II Tim
			Tit
			Phm

[9] Alexander Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, 2d ed. rev. by C. S. C. Williams (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1954), pp. 188–190; F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and Its Transmission, 2d ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), pp. 353–357.

[10] On the evidence of Epiphanius who put Philippians at the end of the list, it has been held (John Knox, Marcion and the New Testament [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942], p. 45) that Philemon was originally conjoined with Colossians, but the existence of a separate Marcionite prologue to Philemon makes this unlikely. At the most we can only say that in the time of Epiphanius, nearly two centuries after Tertullian, there were Marcionite manuscripts which had the order Epiphanius attests.

In Against Marcion IV, 5, Tertullian alludes to writings of Paul in the order Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Thessalonians, Ephesians, and Romans. It is sometimes assumed that this represents the order in which these books stood in the canon accepted by Tertullian himself, but there is nothing in the context to prove this, and one can only guess whether it was supposed chronological or other considerations which led to the use of this order. In the same paragraph Tertullian mentions the four gospels in a noncanonical order too: John, Matthew, Mark, Luke. This passage in Tertullian may accordingly be left out of consideration.[11]

Another list of Paul's letters is found in the well-known Muratorian Fragment, a source which probably belongs, like Tertullian, to a date around A.D. 200. The author states that Paul wrote first to the Corinthians, next to the Galatians, then to the Romans. Thus far it would appear as if the author intended to list Paul's letters in the order in which he considered them to have been written. He did not carry this through, however, but started over again and said that Paul wrote to seven churches in the following order: Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, and Romans. The author states that in this Paul followed the order of his predecessor (sic) John, who wrote to seven churches in the Apocalypse. Then having produced this artificial harmony between Paul and John, the author adds awkwardly to his list: II Corinthians, II Thessalonians, Philemon, Titus, I and II Timothy. Since the writer is obviously straining to create a seven-fold arrangement out of materials which do not fall naturally into such a pattern, it is not necessary to suppose that a volume actually existed in which Paul's letters stood in the order just given. The principle which the author used in placing the seven churches in this particular order is not evident, save that if the Muratorian Fragment originated at Rome, Romans may have been placed in the seventh and climactic place as a matter of emphasis.

Tertullian (Against Marcion IV, 5) and the Muratorian Fragment are, therefore, better evidence for what letters of Paul were

[11] Knox agrees that it is "perhaps precarious" to argue that Tertullian named the books in the order of his canon (Marcion and the New Testament, p. 44, n. 6).

accepted around A.D. 200 than for the order in which those letters might have been found in an actual published volume. Fortunately, however, we now have an extant copy of a collection of Pauline letters from a date probably not later than this very time. This is the Chester Beatty Papyrus of Paul's letters, known as P^{46} and believed to date not later than A.D. 200. This is a codex which was formed, as will appear in what follows, by laying 52 sheets of papyrus together, recto side on top, and folding the whole pile in the middle, thus making 104 folios or leaves.[12] Of these, 86 leaves are preserved. The pages are all numbered at the top, except where the leaf has been so much broken away that the pagination has disappeared. The first preserved leaf contains on the verso Romans 5:17–6:3, and on the recto Romans 6:5–14. The second preserved leaf bears at the top of its first page (verso) the Greek letter kappa (κ) which has the numerical value of 20,[13] and contains Romans 8:15–25. The opening portion of the codex may accordingly be reconstructed as follows:

folio 1 verso	blank	
folio 1 recto page numbered 1	Rom. 1.1 . . .	
folio 2 verso page numbered 2		
folio 2 recto page numbered 3		
folio 3 verso page numbered 4		
folio 3 recto page numbered 5		
folio 4 verso page numbered 6		
folio 4 recto page numbered 7		
folio 5 verso page numbered 8		
folio 5 recto page numbered 9		
folio 6 verso page numbered 10		
folio 6 recto page numbered 11		
folio 7 verso page numbered 12		
folio 7 recto page numbered 13	. . . Rom. 5:16	
folio 8 verso page numbered 14	Rom. 5:17–6:3	preserved
folio 8 recto page numbered 15	Rom. 6:5–14	preserved
folio 9 verso page numbered 16	Rom. 6:15 . . .	
folio 9 recto page numbered 17		
folio 10 verso page numbered 18		
folio 10 recto page numbered 19	. . . Rom. 8:14	
folio 11 verso page numbered 20	Rom. 8:15–25	preserved

[12] Folio from Latin *folium*, leaf; *recto*, right or front; *verso*, reverse or left.

[13] See the table of numerical values of Greek letters in the appendix at the end of this article.

Page 20, beginning with Romans 8:15, contains 23 lines of Greek and where the page is broken away at the bottom there must have been 4 more lines to contain the balance of the text before Romans 8:27 at the top of the next page. In the entire codex the number of lines varies between 25 and 32 per page. On page 20, 23 lines of Greek contain Romans 8:15–25; in the printed Westcott and Hort text the same passage occupies 20 lines. The 7 leaves and 13 numbered pages of the codex prior to the first preserved page beginning with Romans 5:17, would have provided a minimum of 325 lines of writing space. In Westcott and Hort, Romans 1:1 to 5:17 occupies 264 lines. Thus it is clear that the codex provided adequate room to begin with the beginning of Romans.

Since 7 leaves are lost at the beginning of the codex, 7 must be missing from the end. These too, assuming that the last page was left blank, would have provided a minimum of 325 lines of writing space. The preserved fragment of the last page, folio 97 verso, ends with I Thessalonians 5:28. II Thessalonians contains 101 lines in Westcott and Hort; thus there was abundant space for this book in the codex and it doubtless once stood there. Philemon contains 42 lines in Westcott and Hort, and may have been in P^{46} too. Room did not then remain, however, for I and II Timothy and Titus unless additional leaves were glued on at the end, a procedure which is at least a possibility.

Having dealt with the problem of the missing beginning and end of this codex we may now list here and in column 2 of Table 1 the books it contains and those we have deduced once stood at its end: Romans, Hebrews, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians, II Thessalonians (?), Philemon (?).

Codex Vaticanus, designated as B and dating probably in the middle of the fourth century, contains the Pauline letters in the following order: Romans, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians, II Thessalonians, Hebrews. At Hebrews 9:14 the manuscript breaks off. In this manuscript the letters of Paul have chapter divisions which are numbered consecutively through the entire collection rather than beginning afresh with each epistle. These chapter numbers show that when they were originally devised Hebrews

stood after Galatians. This order is reproduced in column 3 of Table 1.

Codex Sinaiticus, known as S and probably but slightly younger than Codex Vaticanus, contains the Pauline letters in this order (column 4 of Table 1): Romans, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians, II Thessalonians, Hebrews, I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus, Philemon.

The four columns of Table 1 now present us with the elements of our problem. Here is the order in which the Pauline letters stood in the oldest canon which can be reconstructed from literary reference, and in the three oldest extant manuscripts. What is the principle according to which the letters were arranged in these lists?

Two points which appear may be quickly disposed of. The first is the heading of the list of Paul's letters by Galatians in the canon of Marcion. This is readily explicable in view of Marcion's theological position. Since he was strongly opposed to Old Testament religion, he put at the head of his group of Paul's letters that epistle in which the apostle most vehemently attacked the Judaizers. The second point is the inclusion of Hebrews among Paul's letters in P^{46}, B, and S. This is also not surprising since all these manuscripts may have come from Egypt, and it was common Egyptian opinion that Paul wrote Hebrews. Clement of Alexandria, for example, who lived at the very time to which P^{46} is attributed, said explicitly that Hebrews was the work of Paul, written in Hebrew for the Hebrews but translated and published by Luke for the Greeks (Eusebius, Church History, VI, xiv, 2). Already in these manuscripts, however, Hebrews can be seen dropping toward a place at the end of the Pauline collection, and finally it fell quite out of it altogether.

The position of Galatians in Marcion's canon, and of Hebrews in the other three lists, may be left aside then as further consideration is given to the principle of order in these lists. In the discussion cited at the beginning of this article, Knox points to what the present writer considers the correct answer to the problem, namely that Marcion's order is that of length and that such an order would also have been the natural one for the original editor

of the Pauline collection to use. Then, however, Knox abandons the solution thus indicated in favor of the complex hypothesis of a two-roll collection, one roll headed by Ephesians, the other by Romans, which means an order determined by factors other than relative length. It has already been shown that the entire Pauline collection was probably contained in a single codex, and the balance of the present article is intended to demonstrate that the principle of relative length is the simple and sufficient clue to order. This obviously makes it necessary to ascertain the length of the several epistles,[14] and this in turn raises the question of how to measure that length and of how an ancient editor would have measured it.

To state the length of an epistle in terms of how many chapters or verses it contains would be highly imprecise since each of these units is itself so variable in extent. More significant would be the number of pages the epistle occupies, or the number of space lines it fills, while a count of words or preferably letters should be most accurate of all.

The approximate number of pages occupied by the Pauline epistles in the Westcott and Hort Greek text (WH), Codex Sinaiticus (S), and P^{46} is shown in the first three columns of Table 2. The number of lines of text in Codex Vaticanus (B) is available from Theodor Zahn,[15] and was counted for Hebrews, Ephesians, Galatians, and Philippians in P^{46} by two of my students, Carl L. Clower and Bruce K. Wood. These figures are given in columns 4 and 5.

The number of letters in the epistles was calculated by Charles Graux [16] with results as shown in column 6 of Table 2.[17] Actual counts in P^{46} were made by Clower and Wood. Here there is the difficulty that several lines are missing from most of the pages of the papyrus. In the publication of the text by Frederic G. Kenyon,[18] the probable reading of the lost lines has been restored as

[14] From this point on, the writings of Paul are called epistles, to avoid confusion with references to letters in the sense of alphabetic characters.

[15] Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons II (1890), pp. 392, 395.

[16] "Nouvelles recherches sur la stichométrie," in Revue de Philologie 2 (1878), pp. 97–143.

[17] Ibid., p. 119.

[18] The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. III Supp., Pauline Epistles, Text (1936), Plates (1937).

Table 2

Epistles	Pages			Lines		Letters			Stichoi						
	1. WH	2. S	3. P^{46}	4. B	5. P^{46}	6. Graux	7. P^{46}	8. P^{46} (with Abbrev. replaced)	9. Harris (16 Syllables)	10. Harris (16 Syllables with Abbrev.)	11. Kenyon (36 letters)	12. "Euthalius"	13. D^{p}	14. S	15. P^{46}
Romans	$26\frac{1}{2}$	$13\frac{1}{4}$	40[a]	2,075		35,266			942	919	977	920	1,040		1,000
I Corinthians	$24\frac{1}{4}$	$12\frac{3}{4}$	$45\frac{1}{2}$	1,980		32,685			897	874	933	870	1,060		
II Corinthians	17	$8\frac{3}{4}$	28	1,330		21,851			610	596	607	590	70	612	
Galatians	$8\frac{1}{2}$	$4\frac{1}{4}$	$10\frac{1}{4}$	657	311	11,202	10,517	10,874	304	296	311	293	350	312	375
Ephesians	9	$4\frac{1}{2}$	$12\frac{1}{2}$	690	363	11,932	11,482	11,911	325	314	331	312	375	312	316
Philippians	6	3	8	462	243	7,975	7,665	7,952	218	209	221	208		200	225
Colossians	$6\frac{1}{4}$	3	$7\frac{1}{2}$	477		7,745			215	209	215	208	251	300	1[. .]
I Thessalonians	$5\frac{3}{4}$	3	$7\frac{1}{2}$[b]	448		7,468			202	194		193			
II Thessalonians	$3\frac{1}{4}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$		244		4,011			112	106		106		180	
I Timothy	$6\frac{3}{4}$	$3\frac{1}{2}$				8,575			239	234		230	208	250	
II Timothy	5	$2\frac{1}{2}$				6,554			177	170		172	288	180	
Titus	3	$1\frac{1}{2}$				3,595			98	97		97	140	96	
Philemon	$1\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{4}$				1,567			42	40		38	50		
Hebrews	$21\frac{1}{4}$	$10\frac{1}{4}$	$33\frac{1}{2}$		914	26,738	25,537	25,849	714	705	743	703		750	700

long as no more than two lines are missing. In the cases in excess of this, Clower and Wood restored the text from Westcott and Hort. Their results in the epistles counted are given in column 7 of Table 2. Another difficulty arises from the fact that P^{46} uses numerous abbreviations. In Hebrews, Ephesians, Galatians, and Philippians the following words are abbreviated, with various forms as shown in the parentheses: God (θς, θυ, θω, θν), Father (πηρ, πρ, πρς, πρι, πρα), Jesus (ιης, ιηυ, ιην) Christ (χρς, χρυ, χρω, χρν, χς, χυ, χω, χν), Lord (κς, κυ, κω, κν, κε), Son (υις, υιν, υς, υω, υν), Spirit (πνς, πνι, πνα), man (ανος, ανον, ανων), cross (στρου, στρω, στρον, στρν), crucify (εσταν, εστραι), crucify again (αναστρες). Since the epistles of Paul presumably did not contain such abbreviations at the outset, the count should be more dependable if the letters omitted in the abbreviations were replaced. When the letters thus left out because of the abbreviations are supplied again, the total count is as shown in column 8 of Table 2. When this is done the results are closer to those of Graux, and substantiate the approximate and relative accuracy of his calculations.

In ancient times, however, the customary manner of measurement of a manuscript was by the στίχος. This word means a row or line, as a row of trees, or a line of soldiers, and hence is used for a line of writing, or a verse. From it is derived the word stichometry for the science of the measurement of books. The researches in stichometry of Graux,[19] J. Rendel Harris,[20] and others,[21] have suggested that the stichos corresponded originally to a line of hexameter verse such as was used by Homer and Virgil, and amounted usually to some 15 or 16 syllables, or approximately 34 to 38 letters.

Applying these results to the New Testament, Rendel Harris divided the Westcott and Hort text into stichoi of 16 syllables with results for Paul's epistles shown in column 9 of Table 2. Allowing for the possibility of the use of abbreviations, he subtracted one at every occurrence of θεός and χριστός and two for Ἰησοῦς and κύριος, and thus obtained the figures in column 10.

[19] See note 16.

[20] Stichometry (1893); and in The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge XI, pp. 91–94.

[21] Lewis Johnson, "An Unrecognized Factor in New Testament Criticism," in The Modern Churchman 42 (1952), pp. 112–118.

Using Graux's count of letters, Kenyon divided a number of the epistles into stichoi of 36 letters each, with the results in column 11.

The best known system of stichometry in ancient manuscripts of the New Testament is that which is found in certain relatively late Greek codices of the Pauline epistles, Acts, and Catholic epistles, along with certain other apparatus including prologues, tables of Old Testament quotations, and tables of chapter summaries. In many cases the name of Euthalius is attached to this apparatus, and he is described as bishop of Sulca, a place not certainly known. There is reason for dating Euthalius around A.D. 350, although it may be doubted that he himself made the stichometrical calculations which are included in the apparatus in question.[22] As found in Codex Escorial, the "Euthalian" stichometry provides the figures in column 12 of Table 2.

In Codex Claromontanus (D^p), a sixth century manuscript of the Pauline epistles written in Greek and Latin, there stands after Philemon a Latin list of the books of the Bible with numbers of lines. The list has been held to go back to a Greek original of around A.D. 300.[23] The catalogue uses the abbreviation *uer.* for the Latin word *versus*, meaning row, line, or verse, and for the Pauline epistles reads as follows:

Epistulas Pauli
Ad Romanos uer. IXL
Ad Corinthios I uer. ILX
Ad Corinthios II uer. LXX
Ad Galatas uer. CCCL
Ad Efesios uer. CCCLXXV
Ad Timotheum I uer. CCVIIII
Ad Timotheum II uer. CCLXXXVIII
Ad Titum uer. CXL
Ad Colosenses uer. CCLI
Ad Filemonem uer. L

The scribe has obviously been careless in his reproduction of the figures, and by his carelessness probably also omitted Philippians, I Thessalonians, II Thessalonians, and perhaps Hebrews,

[22] J. Armitage Robinson, Euthaliana (Texts and Studies III, 3, 1895).
[23] Souter, op. cit., pp. 194 f.; Zahn, op. cit., II, pp. 157–172.

which one would expect to find in the list after Ephesians. The figures from this list appear in column 13 of Table 2.

In Codex Sinaiticus (S) there are stichometric notations at the end of most of the epistles of Paul, and only here in the entire Bible. According to Tischendorf, they are from a scribe other than those who copied the New Testament, but contemporary with them and working in conjunction with them.[24] The incompleteness of the figures and the probable errors in them, suggest that this was not a fresh count but a partial and careless use of a set of figures already at hand. These notations follow, and the figures from them are in column 14 of Table 2.

II Cor	CTIXWN	XIB
Gal	CTIX	ΓIB
Eph	CTIXWN	ΓIB
Phil	CTIXOI	σ
Col	CTIXWN	T
II Thess	CTIXWN	PΠ
Heb	CTIXOI	ΨN
I Tim	CTIX	σN
II Tim	CTIXWN	PΠ
Tit	CTIXWN	ϙ F
Phm	CTIXWI	

Finally we go all the way back to P^{46}, and here too we find that the epistles of Paul are provided with notations of stichoi. While some of these are partly or wholly lost or illegible, most remain. According to Kenyon, the handwriting is of the early third century, thus is only a little later than the probable time of the original copying of the manuscript. The notations follow, and the stichoi numbers they provide are in column 15 of Table 2.

Rom	στιχ	α̂
Heb	στιχ	ψ
I Cor	missing	
II Cor	uncertain	
Eph	στιχ	τιϛ
Gal	στιχ	τοϵ
Phil	στιχ	σκϵ
Col	στιχ	ρ[. .]

[24] Zahn, op. cit., II, p. 385.

It would be of interest if it were possible to ascertain the exact value assigned to the stichos by the ancient scribe from whom we have these figures. From comparison of columns 15 and 5 in Table 2 it is evident that the stichos was not the same as a space line. For a further comparison we can obtain from columns 7 and 5 the average number of letters per space line. For the epistles counted by Clower and Wood the results are:

Average Letters per Line

Heb	27.94
Eph	31.63
Gal	33.81
Phil	31.54

Knowing the number of letters in the text of P^{46} and the stichometric notations at the end of the epistles, the former can be divided by the latter to give the resultant stichos. Taking the text with the abbreviations as they stand, the figures are:

Resultant Length of Stichos

Heb	36.48
Eph	36.33
Gal	28.05
Phil	34.07

Replacing the letters omitted in the abbreviations, and making the same calculations, the results are:

Resultant Length of Stichos
(with Abbreviations Replaced)

Heb	36.93
Eph	37.70
Gal	29.00
Phil	35.34

It is again evident that the stichos does not correspond with a space line. But it is also the case that no single uniform value for the stichos has been obtained by this calculation. However the over-all average for the last set of figures is 34.74, and this is within the presumed range of 34–38 letters for the standard stichos. Since a uniform figure is not obtained from the data

PACIFIC SCHOOL

found in P^{46}, it seems unlikely that this stichometry was first worked out on the basis of this manuscript. Rather the figures appear to represent the transcription to this papyrus of an even earlier set of figures, the precise basis of which cannot at this time be recovered.

It is important to note, however, that as far as present evidence goes, New Testament stichometry began with the epistles of Paul and is older than our oldest extant collection of those epistles. The fact of this very early application of precise methods of length-measurement to the Pauline epistles is in harmony with the theory that considerations of the length of the epistles were from the first the chief principle governing the order in which they were arranged in the collection.

Now we may return to the lists in Table 1. The position of Galatians in Marcion's canon and of Hebrews in P^{46}, B, and S, has already been explained. Two chief problems remain. The first is, why does Marcion begin with the order Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, and why do P^{46}, B, and S begin with Romans, I Corinthians, and II Corinthians, with I and II Thessalonians at the end of the church letters?

When Corinthians and Thessalonians are considered as one book each, the result can be an order of respective lengths exactly corresponding to the order in which the books are found in the list of Marcion. Reckoning the length by the number of lines in Codex Vaticanus, the figures are:

Corinthians	3310
Romans	2075
Thessalonians	692
Laodiceans (= Ephesians)	690
Colossians	477
Philippians	462

When Corinthians is treated as two books, however, these necessarily fall into place after Romans in accordance with length, and when Thessalonians is in two books these go to the end of the church letters. The number of lines from Codex Vaticanus is:

Romans	2075
I Corinthians	1980

II Corinthians	1330
I Thessalonians	448
II Thessalonians	244

The second problem is the variation in the order of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. The answer here proposed is that the reckoning of length also varied, and that the various orders followed the results of the various calculations. While all the data are no longer available, enough is at hand in the stichoi columns of Table 2 to explain the variations we confront.

In P^{46} we have the order Ephesians, Galatians; in B and S, the order Galatians, Ephesians; and in the collection which Marcion utilized Galatians presumably stood originally in one or the other of these two positions before Marcion himself moved this epistle to the head of his list. Note the several stichometries: According to the stichometry in S the two epistles are of the same length, each having 312 stichoi, and thus either order would be permissible. According to the stichometries of "Euthalius" and D^p, Ephesians is longer and therefore should precede Galatians:

	"Euthalius"	D^p
Ephesians	312	375
Galatians	293	350

But according to the stichometry in P^{46}, Galatians is longer and should come first:

Galatians	375
Ephesians	316

The fact that the stichometry and the actual order of the two epistles in P^{46} do not agree, has already been explained by the hypothesis that the stichometry was copied from another source.

In Marcion we have Colossians, Philippians; in P^{46}, B, and S, Philippians, Colossians. Again the variant stichometries give the clue to the variant orders. According to the "Euthalian" stichometry the two epistles are of identical length, 208 stichoi each. The stichometry in S supports the order of Marcion:

Colossians	300
Philippians	200

The stichometry of P^{46} gives 225 stichoi for Philippians, and has a damaged but evidently smaller figure which began with 100 for Colossians. Kenyon's computation supports the same order:

	P^{46}	Kenyon
Philippians	225	221
Colossians	100+?	215

It seems probable, therefore, that the order of the epistles in the Pauline collection was determined by their respective lengths, and that variation in the determinations of those lengths accounts for the variations in order which appear. That two epistles to one address were kept together, and that epistles to individuals were placed after epistles to churches, are subsidiary items of method which need not obscure the fundamental principle. In all of the evidence nothing appears to support the hypothesis that the collection once existed in two volumes and that Ephesians stood at its head.

Appendix: Greek Numerals

Alpha	α′	1	Omicron	ο′	70
Beta	β′	2	Pi	π′	80
Gamma	γ′	3	Koppa	ϙ′	90
Delta	δ′	4	Rho	ρ′	100
Epsilon	ε′	5	Sigma	σ′	200
Vau	ϝ′	6	Tau	τ′	300
Zeta	ζ′	7	Upsilon	υ′	400
Eta	η′	8	Phi	φ′	500
Theta	θ′	9	Chi	χ′	600
Iota	ι′	10	Psi	ψ′	700
Kappa	κ′	20	Omega	ω′	800
Lambda	λ′	30	Sampi	ϡ′	900
Mu	μ′	40		͵α	1,000
Nu	ν′	50			etc.
Xi	ξ′	60			

EUSEBIUS AND THE GOSPEL TEXT OF CAESAREA

D. S. WALLACE-HADRILL
YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND

THE WORK OF EUSEBIUS of Caesarea has come to be regarded as important for the understanding of the local text of Caesarea. The process by which Eusebius has achieved this position has been exhaustively examined by B. M. Metzger.[1] The present study of the Gospel text of Eusebius is based on a collation of his quotations with the *textus receptus*, the text of Eusebius being that of the G.C.S. editions in all works except the Praeparatio Evangelica, for which Gifford's edition of 1903 has been used.

The works examined are the Prae. Evang. and the Dem. Evang. (both dated approximately 310–313); the Theophany (approximately 333–335) in its Greek fragments and its Syriac translation; contra Marc., de Eccles. Theol., Laus Const. (all approximately 335); Vita Const. (after 337). The chronology of these works is of importance only in broad outline — that the Prae. Ev. and Dem. Ev. were works of Eusebius' middle age, and the remainder were works of his old age, forming a group in the 330's.

In the following analysis abbreviations will be used: θ etc. = θ 565.700.; 1 etc. = fams 1 and 13, and their dependents; Alexandrian = ℵABCLRTZΞPQ 33.157. bo sa.; Western = D it vg Cyp.

MATTHEW

Prae. Ev. 14 variants, which show a preponderance of Alexandrian support. Western readings appear as often as Alexandrian, but are not strong (D only appears once).

Dem. Ev. 153 variants. The outstanding characteristic here is that the text of Matthew i–xiii is predominantly Alexandrian, while that of xiv–xxviii shows greatly strengthened representation of θ etc. Alexandrian is strong in both halves of Matthew, supported throughout by Western. θ etc. shows almost a two hundred

[1] J.B.L. 64 (1945), 457–89.

per cent increase after chap. xiv, 1 etc. a fifty per cent increase.

Greek Theoph. 8 variants. Probably Alexandrian with Western support.

Syriac Theoph. 43 variants. Alexandrian with Western support. Western readings alone, unsupported by any other MSS apart from the versions, appear 11 times (Alexandrian alone twice only, "Caesarean" not at all). This may be an aspect of the expected Syriac influence, though it does not appear in comparable strength in the text of the other Gospels used by the Theoph. The affinity of the Western text with the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac is well established. Among Western witness the European Itala is represented more than twice as often as the African Itala.

de Eccles. Theol. 7 variants. Predominantly Alexandrian.

contra Marc. 1 variant. Western.

Laus Const. 4 variants. One θ, the rest feebly Western.

Vita Const. 1 variant. Predominantly Alexandrian.

Although the evidence provided by some of the lesser works of Eusebius is scanty, we may conclude that the dominant text of Eusebius' Matthew is Alexandrian.

Mark

Prae. Ev. No evidence.

Dem. Ev. 44 variants. Predominantly θ etc., with strong support from 1 etc. This confirms the conclusion of Lake.[2]

Greek Theoph. No evidence.

Syriac Theoph. 15 variants. θ etc. appears at first sight to predominate, as Lake concluded, but a strong caution must be added. All except two of these variants occur in passages where the Theoph. is quoting the Dem. Ev. at some length; the considerable quotations of Mark xiv, for example, all derive from the Dem. Ev. The text of the Dem. Ev. for Mark is θ etc., as noted above, and that of the Theoph. at this point does no more than reflect the Dem. Ev. It is very significant, in face of this, that at three points within this quotation from the Dem. Ev. the Theoph. breaks away from its prototype and shows independent readings.

[2] H.T.R. xxi (1928).

Collation of Eusebius' text of Mark at points where the Theoph. is independent of the Dem. Ev. shows that not one of these three (xiv. 66, 67, 71) receives Caesarean support of any kind. In addition to this, the two remaining quotations (i. 24, iii. 27), which do not occur in passages taken from the Dec. Ev., show similar emphasis upon types of text other than θ.

i. 24b Syr. Th. iii. 13 (Σ 91, G.C.S. p. 132 l. 5). Dem. Ev. vi. 13.9 (G.C.S. 263.37) gives the same variant, but the Theoph. is not here quoting the Dem. Ev.

οιδα] οιδαμεν ℵLΔ892 Ir. Or. Bas. Cyr Alex. Tert. Aug. Paulin Ambr. Eug.

iii. 27 Syr. Th. iii. 57 (Σ 109, 110, G.C.S. 152.27)

τα σκευη του ισχυρου εισελθων εις την οικιαν αυτου διαρπασαι] εις τ. οικ. του ισχ. εισελθ. τ. σκ. αυτ. διαρπ. (ℵ)BCLΔθ33. (579) 892.1071. sa bo syr(sin.pesh.) geo aeth.

xiv. 66 Syr. Th. v. 40 (Σ 200, G.C.S. 247.12)

και om. L

[κατω om. DΨ 69.78.472.565.067. a c ff q syr(sin) geo (= Dem. Ev.)]

xiv. 67 Syr. Th. v. 40 (Σ 200, G.C.S. 247.13)

[τον πετρον] αυτον fam 1. fam 13 (exc. 124) 543.565.700. c syr(sin.pesh) geo arm (= Dem. Ev.)]

λεγει + αυτω D c ff q sa bo syr(sin.pesh.) Gressmann's translation (G.C.S.), ". . . blickte sie ihn an und sagte zu ihm."

xiv. 71 Syr. Th. v. 40 (Σ 200, G.C.S. 247.21)

ομνυναι] λεγειν D (a) q vg(1 MS) Gressmann's trans., "er aber begann zu fluchen und zu sagen: ich kenne . . ."

οτι om.

The only appearance of θ in these five independent verses (iii. 27) is unsupported by any other Caesarean witness except the Georgian, and is embedded in strong Alexandrian witness. Alexandrian readings appear here four times, Western twice. These important moments of independence in the text of the Theoph. suggest that we should not follow Lake in thinking of it as θ, but rather as Alexandrian.

de Eccles. Theol. 3 variants. Probably θ etc. with support from 1 etc.

contra Marc., Laus Const., Vita Const. No evidence.

Luke

Prae. Ev. 2 variants. One Western, one weak Alexandrian.

Dem. Ev. 64 variants. Alexandrian with Western support. Alexandrian is very strong here, only 157 being notable for its absence. B is continually present, supported by the less prominent members of the Alexandrian group.

Greek Theoph. 3 variants. Such little evidence as is shown here is Alexandrian.

Syriac Theoph. 4 variants. As far as the evidence goes, it is Alexandrian with Western support.

de Eccles. Theol. 3 variants. Alexandrian with Western support, the former at its strongest in all three variants.

contra Marc., Laus Const., Vita Const. No evidence.

Eusebius' text of Luke in the works which afford evidence is, therefore, almost without admixture Alexandrian.

John

Prae. Ev. 6 variants. 1 etc. is represented in five variants, Alexandrian in three, θ etc. in three (not very strongly). Western is very weak. There is too little evidence here on which to base a clear opinion of the text, but numerically at least the emphasis seems to be upon 1 etc.

Dem. Ev. 21 variants. Numerically the Alexandrian and Western elements are predominant, but the ℵB combination appears only four times, and D only four times. The most constant witness here is 1 etc., supported by θ etc.

Greek Theoph. No evidence.

Syriac Theoph. 3 variants. The only group to appear in more than one variant is 1 etc.

de Eccles. Theol. 23 variants. Despite a weakness in its minuscules 33 and 157, the Alexandrian is very strongly dominant, supported by Western.

contra Marc. 3 variants. Alexandrian and Western alone are represented, the former being very much the stronger.

Laus Const., Vita Const. No evidence.

In so far as any clear picture emerges from this analysis of the evidence for John, it is of 1 etc., with Alexandrian gradually coming to the fore in the later works.

Before attempting to draw any conclusions from this evidence, we may draw attention to Origen's Gospel quotations, a collation of which Professor K. W. Kim is giving us. Examining Origen's Gospel text in six works written between his arrival in Caesarea in 231 and his death in 254, Kim shows that in the first two (the completion of the Comm. on John and On Prayer) the text of Matthew is Alexandrian; after that it is represented by 1 — 1582. The text of Luke in the Comm. on Matthew is Alexandrian. The text of John is Alexandrian in the first two of the six works (Comm. on John and On Prayer) and in the last two (Comm. on Matthew and Contra Celsum), and Kim thinks it probable that Origen used this text throughout his life. Origen's text of Mark, as Streeter and Lake concluded, changed at book xi of the Comm. on John from Alexandrian to Caesarean.

The dominant text of Eusebius' Matthew is Alexandrian; that of his Mark is θ etc. — emphatically so if Lake is right in calling the text of the Syriac Theophany θ; that of Luke is Alexandrian; that of John is 1 etc. at first, with the Alexandrian coming forward in later works. This witness is consistent with, or at least not contradictory of that of Origen. The Alexandrian *plus* 1 etc. of Origen's Matthew is reflected in that of Eusebius: the θ-emphasis of Origen's Mark appears in that of Eusebius; the solitary Alexandrian witness for Luke in Origen's Commentary on Matthew is confirmed strongly by the almost unadulterated Alexandrian Luke of Eusebius; the Alexandrian *plus* 1 etc. of Origen's John again appears in that of Eusebius.

It is, however, more the differences between Origen and Eusebius than the similarities which are our chief concern, and which present a question to which an answer will be put forward. Origen, in Matthew, abandoned Alexandrian for 1 etc.: why in Eusebius do we find Alexandrian again dominant? In John, Origen's text is predominantly Alexandrian; why in the earlier work of Eusebius do we find 1 etc. dominant? And if some influence working

upon Eusebius caused him consciously or unconsciously to depart from the text of Origen in Matthew and John, why not also in Mark and Luke?

We should remind ourselves at this point of the unknown factor of personal preference for one text or one MS on the part of Eusebius. Such a preference may go beyond reason; Eusebius could prefer one MS to another because it was hallowed by associations with Pamphilus, or because of its clear calligraphy, or for any of a dozen such reasons. We have only to mention this to dismiss it, for though it may serve as a warning against over-confidence, it must of necessity be ignored as a known factor in the problem.

It is likely that 1 etc. and θ etc. are descended from a common ancestor, to be located in Egypt. This is the conclusion of Ayuso,[3] following Lagrange,[4] and, with some modification, the conclusion also of Lake [5] and Kenyon.[6] The arguments are very strong in favor of an Egyptian ancestry for 1 etc. at least; and the similarities between 1 etc. and θ etc. are so marked as to make it very probable that they spring from the same stock. Lake suggested that 1 etc., which he styled tentatively the Old Egyptian text, might have been taken to Caesarea by Origen in 231. He had pointed out earlier [7] that the text of Mark in the first five books of the Commentary on John was at least as consistent with θ etc. as with the Alexandrian text. This was not conclusive, nor did Lake mean it to be; it was a demonstration of the lack of a clearly-defined text of any sort in the books concerned. Ayuso places θ etc. east of Suez as a recension of the more primitive and more Western 1 etc.[8] This does not incline us to see much necessary connection between θ etc. and Origen in Alexandria. Further, if Origen was acquainted with 1 etc. and θ etc. in Egypt, it is hard to account for his decisive rejection of the Alexandrian text of Matthew and Mark after his arrival in Caesarea in favor of those two groups. If he considered them so superior to the Alexandrian, he would have used them before leaving Alexandria;

[3] Biblica 16 (1935), 369–415.
[4] Rev. Biblique xxxviii (1929), p. 507; cited by Ayuso p. 372.
[5] Studies and Documents xi (1941), p. 8.
[6] The Text of the Greek Bible, 2nd. ed., p. 190.
[7] H.T.R. xxi (1928).
[8] Op. cit. p. 378.

if he knew them and preferred the Alexandrian, he would not have changed to them after reaching Caesarea. It seems likely that 1 etc. and θ etc. were in Caesarea before Origen arrived there. If there is any link to be found between the primitive 1 etc. and θ etc. in Egypt and the Alexandrian text which is represented in the work of Origen, such a link might be illuminated by study of the earlier Egyptian Fathers such as Clement. Barnard's study of Clement's text [9] leads Burkitt, in his introduction to Barnard's work, to the conclusion that Clement's text was mainly Western, with some striking agreements with the Sinaitic Syriac.

There is no indication that Origen recommended the Alexandrian text especially to the Caesarean Church on his arrival in 231. Rather the contrary, in view of his abandonment of it within a short time. Yet the evidence of Eusebius shows that by the first decade of the next century the Alexandrian text was firmly rooted in Caesarea. It is possible that Origen's reputation for scholarship and sanctity [10] would give some authority to the text he had brought with him, although he had himself abandoned it. We may assume Christian congregations to have been then, as now, conservative in their attachment to certain forms of text, and we must allow at least a generation to pass before a new text becomes so familiar as to influence the minds of copyists who are transcribing the old text. It is suggested that towards the end of the third century in Caesarea the standard 1 etc. *plus* θ etc. was being influenced by the Alexandrian text, and that newly transcribed copies of the former would increasingly show readings drawn from the latter.

The extent to which the influence of the Alexandrian text would be felt would depend upon the amount of copying executed. It is likely that in an ecclesiastical centre such as Caesarea, boasting since Origen's arrival a flourishing catechetical school, a considerable amount of copying of texts would take place. The texts most frequently copied would be those most frequently in demand. Among the gospels, the order of popularity seems to have been Matthew, John, Luke, Mark,[11] and it is therefore reasonable to

[9] Texts and Studies V (1899).
[10] Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vi. 18.
[11] A brief survey of gospel quotations in four Fathers other than Eusebius shows

think that the gospels would be copied in this order of frequency. It may be added that the infrequent use of Mark for lectionary purposes in churches would diminish its frequency of copying still further.[12] We may then expect to find the influence of the Alexandrian text exerting itself upon the four gospels in this order, Matthew showing the most Alexandrian influence, Mark the least.

With the exception of Luke, this is in fact what we do find in the evidence of Eusebius. His text of Matthew appears to be very considerably influenced by Alexandrian readings; his text of John shows what may be an interesting transitional stage, with Alexandrian influence increasing through the first half of the fourth century; his text of Mark shows the process of influence hardly begun, one work only showing strong Alexandrian witness. If the explanation offered here is well founded, the Eusebian text of Luke ought to show a position midway between that of John and Mark, with the local text dominant but the Alexandrian beginning to be felt, at least in the later works; but in fact the text of Luke remains strongly Alexandrian throughout. The evidence for Luke may mean no more than that Eusebius remained loyal not to one text but to one MS throughout his literary life. Such a thing would not be impossible. It is, however, in no way contradictory of the present argument that there should be a purely Alexandrian text of Luke in use in Caesarea in 310; Origen had such a text in his possession in Caesarea when working on his Commentary on Matthew. If the evidence of Luke does not support the argument, neither does it refute it. It would only be damaging to the argument to find a text of Luke showing combined Alexandrian and Caesarean readings at an early date in the fourth century, and we do not find this.

We must be mindful of the danger of building too intricate a theory upon the foundations of the quotations of Eusebius, in view of the dangerously wide margin of possible error and inaccuracy. We are then perhaps justified only in saying that the

---

the following figures for frequency of quotation, the most frequently quoted gospel being scaled to 100: Cyprian (Epistles, Treatises) Matthew 100, Mark 2, Luke 50, John 90; Origen (de Princ. Contra Cels.) Matthew 100, Mark 8, Luke 33, John 75; Chrysostom (On the Priesthood) Matthew 100, Mark 5, Luke 10, John 60; Athanasius (Against Arians, Nicene Def.) Matthew 29, Mark 2, Luke 5, John 100.

[12] Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 47, 64.

Matthew of Eusebius appears to be most influenced by Alexandrian readings, his Mark least so, his John lying between them, without stressing the apparent transition of the latter from 1 etc. to Alexandrian. Such caution is rendered the more necessary by the paucity of evidence in some of the works concerned.

Western influence is found in the quotations of Eusebius particularly in combination with Alexandrian readings. Western influence seems to be most marked in the Syriac Theophany. In the Greek original of the Theophany, though Western readings are strongly represented, they are tempered by almost equally strong Alexandrian readings. The greater strength of the Western text in the Syriac translation may be a by-product of the Syriac influence upon the translator. The general affinity of Western with Alexandrian here suggests that the former may have been introduced with the latter from Egypt. Here we may wish for some confirmation of Burkitt's conclusion that the text of Clement of Alexandria was mainly Western.[13]

The Syriac Theophany shows Western influence of the European type rather than the African. The Theophany gives 27 Western readings of Matthew; European Western MSS are represented 21 times against African Western 10 times. This may be compared with the Western readings of Matthew in the Dem. Ev. — 94 readings, 64 European, 59 African. Bearing in mind the Western affinities of the old Syriac versions, we may conclude that the Western influence reached the text of the Theophany through the Syriac translator.

The interpretation of the evidence which we have put forward may be summarized: The primitive text of Egypt, θ etc. *plus* 1 etc.,[14] was brought to Caesarea before the time of Origen, and became the standard text of Caesarea. Origen brought the Alexandrian text to Caesarea in 231; this text began to influence the standard Caesarean text. The process of influence is to be seen in the texts used by Eusebius between 310 and 340.

If this conclusion is correct, it throws some little light upon the method of Eusebius in using gospel texts. Unlike Origen, who

[13] It may be noted that Streeter accepts the conclusion, Four Gospels, p. 57.

[14] Streeter, H.T.R. xxviii (1935), p. 234, suggests that an ancestor of ℵ was crossed by a MS of the Caesarean type.

appears to have chosen his text on some ground of principle and remained loyal to it, Eusebius gives the impression of using any text which comes to hand, except perhaps in Luke. If he had shown strong preference for one type of text and adhered to that throughout his literary life, we might have learned little from his quotations. But his apparently haphazard method shows us a picture of a developing local text, in its last stage of development before being submerged beneath the rising tide of the Byzantine.

PERSISCHE WEISHEIT IN GRIECHISCHEM GEWANDE?

J. DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN
Liège, Belgium

Peu d'articles ont une telle importance, pour la question des rapports entre la pensée grecque et la pensée iranienne, que l'étude publiée en 1923, dans la Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, par Alb. Götze, sous le titre très significatif de "Persische Weisheit in griechischem Gewande."

On sait que l'Iran a professé certaines doctrines qui ne sont pas sans analogie avec celles de philosophes grecs. La question est depuis longtemps débattue de savoir ce que les Grecs, ce que Platon, par exemple, ont pu devoir à l'Iran. Une des difficultés de la démonstration vient de l'absence de chronologie du côté iranien. Le Bundahishn et le Dênkart, où est exposé, entre autres dogmes, celui de la préexistence spirituelle du monde, ne datent, dans la rédaction que nous en avons, que du IX^{e} siècle de notre ère. Ils reflètent certainement des spéculations plus anciennes et se donnent, en effet, pour des paraphrases ou résumés de morceaux avestiques aujourd'hui perdus. Mais l'Avesta lui-même était un ouvrage composite dont les diverses parties dataient d'époques très différentes, depuis les gâthâs de Zarathustra, antérieures d'au moins six siècles à notre ère, jusqu'aux additions faites sous Shâpur, quelque mille ans plus tard.

Une doctrine iranienne, dans ces conditions, ne peut guère être datée sans quelque aide extérieure. C'est un tel secours qu'a pensé trouver Götze, dans un texte grec extrait du De Hebdomadibus, sur lequel son attention avait été attirée par l'étude qu'en avait donnée F. Boll. (Ce détail, on le verra, est capital.) L'ouvrage grec expose notamment qu'à chaque partie du corps humain correspond une partie de l'univers, doctrine professée aussi par le Bundahishn. Certes, devant ce rapprochement, la première réaction de l'helléniste, qui sait que l'ouvrage grec remonte au moins au V^{e} siècle avant J.-C., est de conclure que l'emprunt, si emprunt il y a, s'est fait dans la direction de Grèce à Iran. Ainsi fait von Wesendonk, Urmensch und Seele, 1924, qui adresse à Götze ce

reproche, p. 122: "Auf den naheliegenden Gedanken, hellenistische Einflüsse im grossen Bundahishn zu suchen, ist er nicht gestossen." Le ton de polémique, à distance, nous amuse, car Götze était si bien averti de cette possibilité qu'il l'envisageait dès les premières lignes de son article. "Wesendonk muss davon nichts gelesen oder wenigstens nichts verstanden haben," commente fort justement Reitzenstein, Studien zum antiken Synkretismus, 1926, p. 124. Toute l'argumentation de Götze visait précisément, après avoir montré que les documents grec et iranien se ressemblent trop pour que cette similitude soit fortuite, à faire voir que, des deux, le texte grec ne peut être l'original.

Sa thèse, dont nous examinerons ci-dessous le bien-fondé, fut accueillie avec enthousiasme, ou avec un scepticisme embarrassé. Elle ne pouvait laisser indifférent. Reitzenstein y trouvait la plus éclatante autorisation, fournie par un orientaliste, de ses théories sur les origines iraniennes de la mystique grecque, et une impulsion nouvelle pour développer ces vues. Le Dâmdât Nask, livre perdu de l'Avesta paraphrasé par le Bundahishn, étant désormais assignable, grâce à l'emprunt qu'y avaient fait les Grecs, au moins au V^e^ siècle, Platon avait donc pu le connaître, et y puiser à pleines mains. C'est ce que fit valoir Reitzenstein dans ses Studien, où son collaborateur H. Schaeder rééditait, dans leur formulation du Bundahishn, les doctrines cosmologiques de l'Iran, sources présumées de l'idéalisme et du dualisme platoniciens!

L'immensité même de la perspective ainsi ouverte faisait reculer les philologues plus prudents que Reitzenstein; mais la plupart, au lieu de reprendre l'ensemble de la question, se contentèrent de tourner autour, en montrant, par exemple, que Reitzenstein avait plusieurs fois abusé de la documentation iranienne,[1] ou fermèrent les yeux, comme von Wesendonk. Deux seulement, M. Wellmann et W. Kranz, l'un et l'autre hellénistes éminents, ont travaillé en profondeur. Mais l'un n'a envisagé qu'une moitié du problème et ne pouvait conclure sur l'ensemble; l'autre a repris la question tout entière, mais paraît bien avoir conclu à contre-sens, comme on va voir.

La thèse de Götze reposait sur deux arguments principaux.

[1] Cf. J. Duchesne-Guillemin, Ormazd et Ahriman, Paris, 1952, p. 115 sq., et p. 99 sq., avec référence aux travaux de Koster, Festugière, etc.

Primo, la doctrine du De Hebdomadibus apparaît en Grèce brusquement et isolément, tel un bloc erratique (p. 79). Il y a donc chance qu'elle soit un apport étranger; le véhicule en a été probablement l'École de Cnide, qui a dû communiquer avec la Perse grâce aux séjours de médecins grecs à la cour achéménide.

Secundo, le document grec n'offre pas une doctrine homogène et cohérente, et ne peut se comprendre que comme une adaptation assez peu adroite: "Ohne die persische Parallele lässt sich die Anordnung des Heptadisten nicht verstehen."

Le premier argument a déjà été considérablement affaibli par M. Wellmann, qui a décelé, dans ce prétendu bloc erratique, quantité d'éléments appartenant au stock des idées pythagoriceinnes,[2] et a montré, de plus, que toute la doctrine, loin d'être sûrement cnidienne, devait plutôt ressortir à l'École de Cyrène, ce qui nous éloigne de l'Iran et met hors de jeu les médecins grecs employés par le roi perse. Tel est en substance l'article de Wellmann, qui ne va pas plus loin. W. Kranz reprend l'argument et retrouve la doctrine de l'heptadiste, ou une doctrine approchante, dans plusieurs ouvrages grecs: livres I et IV du Peri diaitês et fragment de Choirilos.[3] Ainsi, le "bloc erratique dans l'Hellade" se trouve avoir des frères, comme l'écrit textuellement Kranz, p. 131, sans paraître s'effrayer de cette contradiction. Mais ce point n'est pas le principal de son article, qui a pour pièce maîtresse la mise en œuvre d'une constatation aussi importante qu'inattendue, à savoir, que le texte grec pris par Götze pour base de comparaison

[2] M. Wellmann, Die pseudo-hippokratische Schrift Peri Hebdomadôn, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaft und Medizin, 4, 1, Berlin 1933: "Auf pythagoreischer Lehre beruht was unser Heptadist über die 7-Zahl der Planeten sagt, ferner über die Kugelgestalt der Erde und die Antipoden, seine Lehre von der Erhellung der Fixsterne durch die Sonne, von dem Verhältnis des Makrokosmos und Mikrokosmos. Pythagoreisch ist weiter die Vorstellung, dass die 3-Zahl die vollkommene Begrenzung abgebe, weil sie Anfnag, Mitte und Ende in sich schliesst, die Unterscheidung von zwei Arten der Sonnenwärme . . . Pythagoreisch ist indirekt die Theorie von den 7 natürlichen Prinzipien des menschlichen Körpers: Feuer, Wasser, Luft, Erde, Galle, Blut und Schleim, und von den 7 lebenswichtigen Funktionen des Kopfes, zu denen unser Autor die Sinne rechnet, nur fehlt bei ihm nach Vorgang des Pythagoreers Alkmaion der Tastsinn."

[3] W. Kranz, Kosmos und Mensch in der Vorstellung frühen Griechentums, Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-histor. Kl., Fachgr. I, 1938, pp. 121–161. Il s'agit du tragique (non de l'épique), comme l'a vu Koster, Le Mythe de Platon, 1951, p. 31.

avait été indûment tronqué par Fr. Boll, qui l'avait étudié avant lui. Il faut l'"enchaîner" à la suite, pour que se manifeste une structure d'ensemble. Nous retrouvons ici le second argument de Götze, tiré d'une prétendue incohérence du texte grec, et cet argument s'effondre: le texte, une fois ressoudé, apparaît solidement construit. L'univers y est parcouru de bas en haut, en sept étapes:

↑ Firmament
Etoiles
Soleil
Lune
Air
Eau
Terre.

(Le texte tronqué par Boll ne comportait que Terre-Eau-Air-Lune; la terre et l'eau étant chacune divisée en trois couches, cela donnait l'apparence d'un nombre suffisant d'éléments pour constituer l'heptade. La lune était même de trop, à vrai dire.)

Seul le système complet rend compte, notamment, de l'équation lune-sensus, ou plutôt, dans l'original reconstitué, *σελήνη-φρὴν* (où *φρὴν* signifiait "diaphragme" et n'a plus été exactement compris par le traducteur latin). Le diaphragme divise en effet le corps par le milieu, comme la lune (c'est-à-dire la sphere de la lune) est à égale distance du centre du monde et de sa périphérie.

Ce dernier détail suffirait à suggérer que nous avons affaire à une conception envisageant le monde non comme une échelle de degrés, mais comme un ensemble de sphères concentriques. Ceci est confirmé par l'identification du Firmament à la Peau et des Étoiles à la "Chaleur qui est sous la peau": visiblement, ce qui enveloppe le corps est comparé à l'*enveloppe* de l'univers, lequel est donc considéré comme sphéroïde — alors que, dans les mythes plus primitifs, comme chez les Chinois [4] ou dans le Véda, c'est à la tête de l'homme que le ciel correspond, étant simplement le plus élevé des échelons de l'univers. Le document grec nous met manifestement en présence de la "conception nouvelle" dont Nilsson,[5] à la suite d'Eisler et de Burkitt, a montré, dans le domaine religieux, l'incidence révolutionnaire.

[4] Cf. ci-dessous.
[5] Geschichte der griechischen Religion, II, 1950, p. 673 sq.

Seule une pièce paraît manquer: les planètes. Mais peut-être l'original grec les mentionnait-il et se dissimulent-elles sous la traduction latine? On n'aura plus compris que le firmament était le lieu des fixes et on aura confondu ceux-ci avec les planètes sous le vocable général de *stellae*.

Rien, en tout cas, de ce système grandiose ne se retrouve en Iran, où les identifications, quand elles ne sont pas simplement obvies, comme celle de la terre à la chair, des os aux montagnes, du sang des artères à l'eau des fleuves, du souffle au vent, sont tout autres que les identifications grecques.[6] — L'absence de l'équivalence cheveux-végétation dans la doctrine grecque, absence d'autant plus surprenante, pour W. Kranz, que c'est là une métaphore courante de la poésie et de la mythologie grecques, reçoit maintenant son explication. Il n'y avait pas place pour cette équivalence dans un système qui s'efforçait de ranger les parties du corps, et celles du monde, en allant du dedans au dehors: les cheveux et poils, plus extérieurs encore que la peau, auraient eu pour correspondant cosmique quelque chose au delà du firmament, et non les terrestres frondaisons.

En somme, Kranz a démontré, mieux encore qu'il ne pensait, que la doctrine grecque est un tout cohérent et homogène. Mais il n'a pas vu qu'il ruinait ainsi l'argument principal de Götze en faveur d'une origine iranienne de cette doctrine. Comme il a aussi dévalorisé l'autre argument, celui de l'"erratischer Block in Hellas," en trouvant des frères à cet enfant unique, on peut considérer la thèse de Götze comme réfutée.[7]

Cependant, nous restons en présence du problème que Götze a eu l'incontestable mérite de poser: comment rendre compte de la ressemblance de doctrine entre les documents grecs et le Bunda-

[6] Il n'y a pas lieu d'insister, plus que Götze n'a paru y tenir lui-même, sur la paire iranienne *moëlle-métal*, qui serait l'original du rapprochement entre *medulla cerebrum semen* et *quod in terra calidum humidum*, la différence s'expliquant, selon Götze, par le terme iranien av. *ayō xšustəm*, littéralement "métal en fusion," expression composée dont on n'aurait retenu que le second terme: "en fusion." On se demande vraiment comment le traducteur supposé du perse en grec aurait pu méconnaître l'image si parlante des métaux enfouis (à l'état de minerai) "dans les entrailles de la terre" (ainsi disons-nous encore), comme la moëlle dans le corps de l'homme.

[7] Ceci répond à Widengren, Stand und Aufgaben der iranischen Religionsgeschichte, Numen 1955, p. 79. Sa critique a été le point de départ du présent essai de mise au point.

hishn? — On serait tenté de prendre le contre-pied de sa thèse et de conclure, comme semble y inviter la chronologie, à un emprunt fait par l'Iran à la Grèce. Cependant, des faits nouveaux, des études parues depuis la sienne — et sous l'impulsion de la sienne — engagent à rechercher une solution plus nuancée.

L'idée de macro-microcosme n'était pas seulement connue en Grèce, dans l'Iran et dans l'Inde, mais se retrouve ailleurs sous la forme rudimentaire du mythe selon lequel, un géant primordial étant mis à mort, les parties de son corps donnent naissance aux parties de l'univers. Chez les Scandinaves, Ymir est tué par Odin, Vili et Ve: de sa chair ils font la terre, de son sang, l'eau, de ses os les montagnes, de ses cheveux les arbres, de son crâne le ciel, etc. Ceci rappelle évidemment le dépècement du Purusha (Homme) selon l'hymne Rigveda X, 90 et le meurtre de Gayômart par Ahriman dans le Bundahishn. La mythologie de Grimm, 4e édition, p. 433, avait déjà signalé le parallèle cochin-chinois à ce mythe, que reprend A. Olerud, L'Idée de macrocosmos et de microcosmos dans le Timée de Platon, Uppsala 1951, p. 147. Il est encore plus intéressant de voir comblé l'espace géographique intermédiaire, Asie centrale et Chine, grâce aux études de Harva et d'Eberhardt, cités ibidem, p. 148, qui retrouvent chez les peuples altaïques et chez les Chinois un mythe tout semblable de dépècement cosmogonique. Quand meurt le géant P'an-ku, disent les Chinois, de son souffle naît le vent, de sa voix le tonnerre, de son œil gauche le soleil, de son droit la lune, de ses cheveux les plantes, etc.

Les documents chinois permettent de dater au moins du XIe siècle avant notre ère ce mythe très ancien, qui a très probablement fait partie, comme l'a montré Rönnow,[8] de l'idéologie du sacrifice humain et été, à ce titre, très répandu dans le monde. On le retrouve dans l'ancienne Babylonie avec le meurtre de Tiamat donnant naissance au monde et celui de Kingir engendrant l'humanité. Il est donc infiniment probable qu'il a eu cours chez les Indo-européens: pourquoi auraient-ils fait exception? C'est

[8] Dans ses études sur le Pravargya (Monde oriental, 1929, p. 113 sq.), sur Zagreus och Dionysos (Religion och Bibel, 1943, p. 14 sq.) et sur Dionysos och Orfeus (cité par Olerud, p. 143, note 1).

donc, chez les Germains, chez les Iraniens et les Indiens — dans l'Edda comme dans le Bundahishn et dans le Veda — un commun héritage. Les Grecs, il est vrai, semblent l'avoir oublié avant de descendre aux rives de l'Egée: Homère n'en a pas trace, ni Hésiode, et l'idée de macrocosme, quand elle apparaît au V^e^ siècle, dans le De Hebdomadibus et ailleurs, fait bien figure d'intruse. Or, cette réintroduction de conceptions abolies est vraisemblablement, comme pour la cosmogonie "orphique" du célèbre Hymne à Zeus (déjà allégué par Götze), le fait de la religion dionysiaque avec son mythe de Zagreus, et de tout le mouvement orphico-dionysiaque. A. Olerud, parce qu'il croyait à un emprunt à l'Iran, a seulement parlé de "possibilités que présente la religion de Dionysos de s'assimiler la spéculation orientale de macro-microcosme." [9] Si l'emprunt à l'Iran est controuvé, on conclura plutôt qu'un mythe barbare, véhiculé par les Thraco-phrygiens depuis les temps et les lieux de la communauté indo-européenne, aura rejoint les Grecs, porté par l'afflux dionysiaque.

Mais cette mythologie ne suffit pas à expliquer le système du De Hebdomadibus: elle n'en a fourni que le substrat, l'idée d'une correspondance, morceau par morceau, entre le corps humain et le monde. D'autres éléments sont manifestement intervenus, qui rendent compte de la structure *septénaire* et *astronomique* du système.

Les deux mots soulignés font immédiatement penser à l'orient. Le nombre sept, d'abord: "Die Sieben als Herrscherin ist Orientalin," écrit p. 149 W. Kranz, qu'on ne songera pas à contredire sur ce point. "Schon im 8. Jahrhundert, wenn nicht früher, poursuit-il, muss sie als solche über die ionische Küste nach Griechenland gedrungen sein, vom Apollokult vor allem aufgenommen und anerkannt." Mais c'est de Babylonie et non d'Iran qu'il s'agit cette fois.

Quant à la conception astronomique des sphères concentriques (entourant une Terre libre dans l'espace), cette conception — qui tient, on l'a vu, à l'essence même de la liste d'équivalences présentée par l'heptadiste grec — n'est autre que la grande innovation intellectuelle, rappelée plus haut, qui, née en partie sous l'influence de Babylone encore, et défendue d'abord par Aris-

[9] On lira avec profit tout le chapître, p. 191 sq., qu'il a consacré à ce sujet.

tarque de Samos, puis par Anaximandre, allait bouleverser, avec Platon et ses successeurs, les bases de la religiosité grecque.[10]

Le texte du Bundahishn, étant donné sa date tardive et l'absence de témoignage antérieur, contient sans doute une part d'emprunt, notamment le classement par cinq. Celui-ci est-il venu de Grèce, où, comme le rappelle Götze, il figure dans le Timée; ou de l'Inde, où il est attesté déjà dans la Chândogya-upanishad et dans le Šatapathabrâhmaṇa? Les deux sont possibles, puisque des doctrines de l'un et l'autre pays ont été incorporées, de façon avouée, à l'Avesta sassanide.[11] En tout cas, la doctrine y a subi un développement dans le sens dualiste, et enfin, comme l'a supposé Götze, d'assez graves altérations, qui prouvent qu'elle n'était plus bien comprise.

Liège

[10] Sur l'importance et la diffusion de cette vision du monde dans la philosophie grecque et l'orphisme, voir l'excellent aperçu de W. Guthrie, The Presocratic World-Picture, Harvard Theological Review, 1952, p. 87 sq.

[11] Voir en dernier lieu R. Zaehner, Zurvan, Oxford 1955 — avec mes Notes on Zervanism publiées à ce propos dans le Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 1956.

THE ROMAN SYNOD OF DECEMBER 800 AND THE ALLEGED TRIAL OF LEO III

A Theory and the Historical Facts

LUITPOLD WALLACH *
University of Oklahoma at Norman

Dedicated to Professor Paul W. Gates

A Roman synod convoked by Charlemagne met on December 1st of the year 800 for the purpose of investigating the accusations levelled against Pope Leo III. In the presence of the pope, the Frankish king presided over an assembly composed of ecclesiastics, Frankish and Roman nobles, including members of the Frankish episcopate — to wit, Arno of Salzburg, Theodulph of Orléans, Riculf of Mayence, Aaron of Angorra, the Saxons Witto and Fredugis, Alcuin's confidants — and other persons of consequence. The eldest son of Charlemagne, Charles, who together with his sisters had accompanied his father to Rome, was another participant.[1]

The accounts contained in ecclesiastical and Frankish historical sources of the proceedings of the Roman Synod of December 800,[2] whose acts are not preserved, seem to be somewhat contradictory and confusing. Historians have repeatedly discussed and argued over the significance of these accounts. The problem is whether to accept the description of the events that took place at St. Peter's in the version of the Liber Pontificalis (LP), the Annales regni Francorum (ArF), the Annales Laureshamenses (AL), or in some combination of these sources.

Louis Halphen [3] bases his reconstruction of the happenings on the LP and the ArF, while rejecting the report of the AL, written

* This paper is an independent sequel to the study quoted below in note 34; the 'coronation' of Charlemagne will be the subject of a third article.

[1] Cf. Abel-Simson, Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter Karl dem Grossen 2 (Leipzig 1883) 224–229.

[2] See the collection of sources by H. Dannenbauer, Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Kaiserkrönung Karls des Grossen (Lietzmann's Kleine Texte No. 161, Berlin, 1931). — I am indebted to Professor Heinrich Dannenbauer for a copy of his Quellen kindly sent to me in December 1954 in remembrance of his Historisches Seminar on 'The Origins of the Pontifical State' conducted at the University of Tübingen in 1931–32.

[3] Études critiques sur l'histoire de Charlemagne (Paris, 1921) 236–238.

under the influence of the Frankish Court, as being partial to a one-sided Frankish interpretation. A similar opinion of the AL is shared by Erich Caspar,[4] while F. L. Ganshof [5] rejects such an assessment of the historical value of the AL. For even if the AL should not be contemporary with the events of the year 800, having been written perhaps in 803, the LP and the ArF are chronologically — so Ganshof argues — even farther removed from these events than are the AL. On these and other grounds Heinrich Fichtenau [6] now attempts the rehabilitation of the AL as a primary source for the important happenings of the year 800. He shows that the author of the AL — probably Richbod of Treves and Lorsch — occasionally wrote in the style of the official Frankish court charter, the placitum; for the year 802 Richbod used the extant Frankish Capitulare missorum generale of 802, a fact already known for a long time. Fichtenau believes that the author of the AL ad a. 800–801 fashioned the text of the annals not only on the basis of his own familiarity with the formulaic phraseology of the Frankish placitum, but also on the basis of 'official protocols' that were accessible to him for his report on the Roman Synod of December 800 and on the negotiations leading to the coronation of Charlemagne on December 25. This assumption is — according to its own originator — a 'bold thesis which will never be confirmed in such a manner that the scholar who clings to previously conceived interpretations will not reject it.' 'But,' he adds, 'anyone who approaches these problems with a somewhat open mind will not deny the probability of such a thesis.'

Several arguments present themselves against the alleged existence of 'official protocols' used by the author of the AL. Had there actually been such documents, these 'protocols' and the AL ought to have shown traces reminiscent of the style of the Acts of the Synod that was in session from December 1st until the 23rd, if

[4] 'Das Papsttum unter fränkischer Herrschaft,' Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 54 (1935) 259.

[5] The Imperial Coronation of Charlemagne: Theories and Facts (Glasgow University Publications 79, 1949) 22–23.

[6] 'Karl der Grosse und das Kaisertum,' Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung 61 (1953) 387 ff., especially pp. 317–320. — I am obliged to Professor Heinrich Fichtenau of the University of Vienna for a reprint of this valuable paper with whose results (with the exception of the 'official protocols') I gladly agree.

not until the 25th of December, the day of Charlemagne's recognition as Imperator Romanorum. But traces of the phraseology of synodal acts are not noticeable in the AL ad a. 800 and 801, whose author describes events connected with these synodal procedures in the formulaic language of the Carolingian placitum. In order to achieve this feat, he needed no recourse to 'official protocols.' Heinrich Dannenbauer [7] characterized the narrative of the AL as 'deliberations that stem in all likelihood from the author's own erudition, and otherwise are designed to explain to himself an unknown or even incomprehensible event. Although the author of the AL is not a good witness of historical facts, especially not for their interrelationship, nevertheless he shows how circles not directly involved in the Roman events attempted to comprehend what was but imperfectly understood by them.' The attempted vindication of the AL as a primary historical source for the reconstruction of the events leading to the coronation of Charlemagne cannot stand the test of a critical analysis, and the negative estimate of Halphen, Dannenbauer, and other historians, remains unshaken by Fichtenau's thesis.

There is only one conclusion one might with some degree of justification draw from Fichtenau's proof of the occurrence of elements of the Frankish placitum in the report of the AL ad a. 800–801, namely, that the presence of Charlemagne, the highest Frankish judge, was to the author of the annals proof of the judicial nature of the synodal proceedings. While it is true, as Hefele-Leclercq [8] state, that these acts are not extant, it can be shown that the original acts were used by the author — not of the AL but of the Liber Pontificalis.

I

The Life of Leo III, the longest biography in the Liber Pontificalis, cannot have originated before the death of Leo in 816.[9] This

[7] 'Zum Kaisertum Karls des Grossen,' Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 49 (1930), 305 f.

[8] Cf. Carl Josef von Hefele, Conciliengeschichte 3 (2nd ed. Freiburg i. B., 1877), 739; Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles 3,2 (Paris, 1910) 1113–1116, speak of 'the Roman Synod of the year 800.'

[9] Léon Levillain, 'Le couronnement impérial de Charlemagne,' Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France 18 (1932) 15.

means that the author had to rely on written material and documents on which to base his narration. The numerous gifts and buildings dedicated, sponsored, or built by Leo, and listed by his biographer, bear out this conclusion. Huelsen [10] already observed the chronological order of many notices in the Vita referring to the activities of Leo. That the author of the Vita used the placitum of the Frankish 'Königsgericht' which in December 799 investigated the accusations of Leo's enemies at Rome, has recently been indicated.[11] The narrative in the LP of this Frankish court action of Carolingian missi is followed by a report of the Roman Synod of December 800, which is based, as we hope next to prove, on the original acts of this synod. We here print this section, and — in order to facilitate reference — we add in the left margin the Roman numerals I–XII representing the individual parts.

Vita Leonis III, in Liber Pontificalis II, ed. L. Duchesne (Paris 1892), 7:

I Qui post modicum tempus ipse *magnus rex*, dum in basilica beati Petri apostoli coniunxisset et cum magno honore susceptus fuisset, *fecit* in eadem aecclesia *congregare archiepiscopos seu episcopos, abbates et omni nobilitate Francorum atque synclitu Romanorum.*

IIa Et *sedentes pariter* tam *magnus rex* quam *beatissimus pontifex*, fecerunt *resedere et sanctissimos archiepiscopos seu episcopos et abbates,*

IIb *stantes reliquos sacerdotes seu optimates Francorum et Romanorum,*

III ut crimina quae adversus almum pontificem dicta fuerant delimarent.

IV Qui *universi* archiepiscopi seu *episcopi* et abbates unianimiter audientes *dixerunt*:

V 'Nos sedem apostolicam, *quae est capud omnium Dei ecclesiarum,* judicare non audemus. Nam ab ipsa nos omnes et vicario suo iudicamur; ipsa autem a nemine iudicatur, quemadmodum et antiquitus mos fuit. Sed sicut ipse summus pontifex censuerit, canonice obediemus.'

VI Venerabilis vero praesul inquit:

'Praedecessorum meorum pontificum vestigia sequor et de

[10] Christian Huelsen, 'Osservazioni sulla biografica di Leone III nel Liber pontificalis,' Rendiconti della pont. accad. rom. di arch. I (1923) 107–119.

[11] Cf. Luitpold Wallach, 'The genuine and the forged oath of Leo III,' Traditio 11 (1955) 39f.

talibus falsis criminibus quae super me nequiter exarserunt, me purificare paratus sum.'

VII Alia vero die, in eadem ecclesia beati Petri apostoli,

VIII *omnes* generaliter *archiepiscopi* seu *episcopi* et *abbates et omnes Franci* qui in servitio eidem *magni regis* fuerunt, *et cuncti Romani* in eadem ecclesia beati Petri apostoli,

IX in eorum praesentia amplectens prelatus venerabilis pontifex sancta Christi quattuor evvangelia coram omnibus ascendit in ambonem et sub iusiurando clara voce dixit:

X '*Quia de* istis criminibus falsis, quibus super me imposuerunt Romani qui inique me persecuti sunt, *scientiam non habeo*, nec talia egisse me cognosco.'

XI Et hoc peractum, *omnes archiepiscopi*, *episcopi* et *abbates* et *cunctus clerus*,

XII letania facta, laudes dederunt Deo atque Dei genetricis semperque virginis Mariae dominae nostrae et beato Petro apostolorum principi omniumque sanctorum Dei.

This text consists of a general Introduction (I), expressly stating that the Concilium Romanum (CR) of December 800 met upon the request of Charlemagne; it mentions the meeting-place, the ecclesiastical participants in their hierarchical order, and the lay groups in attendance. Next follows the order of seating observed by the assembly during the sessions of the synod (II): after king and pope are seated, archbishops, bishops, and abbots (or presbyters) occupy their seats (IIa), while the lower hierarchy (deacons, et al.) and the laymen present stand during the synodal meetings and debates. The accusations levelled against Leo III by his enemies are on the agenda of the synod (III). Parts IV–X contain three verbatim excerpts from the debates that ensued in the course of an unknown number of actiones. The synod closed (XI–XII) with litanies.

Off-hand this report conforms with the basic provisions of the ordo celebrandi concilii set forth in c.4 of the Acts of the Council of Toledo. 633.[12] Part II especially conforms with the rule that

[12] Mansi, Collectio X (Florence 1764) 617 f. Cf. Hans Barion, Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters (Kanonistische Studien und Texte ed. A. M. Koeniger, Bonn-Köln 1931) 55 ff. on the synodal ordines, 76 ff. on the seating order of the participants, 173 ff. on the authority of synodal decisions, 253 ff. on the Carolingian national synods. Cf. Rudolf von Heckel, 'Der Ursprung des päpstlichen Registerwesens,' Archiv für Urkundenforschung 1 (1908), especially

the upper hierarchy is seated during the discussions of the synod, while the lower ranks of the participants, from the deacons down to mere laymen in attendance, occupy only standing room. Compare the following regulations of the ordo:

. . . convenientes omnes *episcopi pariter* introant et *resideant* . . . vocantur deinde *presbiteri* . . . post hoc ingrediantur *diaconi* . . . et *corona facta de sedibus episcoporum*, presbiteri a tergo eorum resideant. *Diacones* in conspectu episcoporum *stent*. Deinde ingrediantur *laici* qui electioni concilii interesse meruerunt. Ingrediantur quoque et *notarii*. . . .

The actual use made of this ordo in the case of some Frankish synods can be shown. Paulinus of Aquileia [13] writes of the opening of the Synod of Frankfurt, 794, convoked by Charlemagne: 'Quadam die *residentibus* cunctis in aula sacri palatii, *adsistentibus in modum coronae* . . . *diaconibus cunctoque clero*, sub praesentia praedicti principis' (scil. Charlemagne). Another application of the same ordo is preserved in Paulinus' report of the Synod of Friuli, 796–797: 'Igitur *resedentibus cunctis ex more* in sedilibus praeparatis, *adsistente* vero circumquaque non modica fratrum consentanea turba in ecclesia . . .' .

The traces of the original Acts of the CR of December 800 preserved in the report of the LP can also be recognized by the comparison of our text with the extant acts of Roman synods (and others), especially the Roman Synods of 769 and 798. Compare, for instance, the structure of our text with the beginnings of the prima actio of the CR of 769 (Conc. I.1.80 f.):

'. . . praesidente ter beatissimo et coangelico Stephano summo pontifice . . . in venerabili basilica salvatoris . . . (*considentibus*) etiam cum eo . . . episcopis, id est . . .' (An enumeration of archbishops, bishops, and presbyters follows. The last mentioned presbyter is called Theodosius, and then we read p. 81.16:)

---

pp. 398, 402, 404, on early synodal acts modeled on Roman 'Gerichtsakten,' and on the imitations of the Gesta of the Roman Senate in other synodal acts. Peter Classen, 'Kaiserreskript und Königsurkunde,' Archiv für Diplomatik 1 (1955) 86 questions this basic dependence, but the evidence is convincing as I hope to show in a future study dealing with the diplomatics of synodal acts.

[13] MGH Concilia 2.1 (Aevi Karolini I.1 Hannover 1904) 131.3. Subsequently always referred to as Conc. I.1.

'*adstante* etiam Anastasio archidiacono et cunctis religiosis Dei famulis . . . atque proceribus ecclesiae et *cuncto clero*, optimatibus etiam miliciae seu cuncti exercitus et honestorum civium et cuncte generalitatis populo . . .' .

Parts I and II of our text are clearly parallel to this text, except that Charlemagne presided over the Synod of 800, while that of 769 was called together under the presidency of Pope Stephen III.

The identical formula observed in the Acts of 769 and 800 is found also in the Gesta of Roman Synods held in the years 495, 531, 595, 600, and 745.[14] The scheme of the exordium in these synodal acta is comprised of the names of the Roman consuls and/or emperors in office, the date and place of the meeting, the pope present and presiding (*residente* or *praesidente*), the bishops and presbyters in attendance (*consedentibus* or *residentibus*), the mention of the deacons (*adstantibus diaconibus*), and other clerics (*cuncto clero*). The same structure of the exordium is clearly preserved in the report of the LP which is derived from the original Acts of the Synod of December 800.

Beatissimus as papal attribute (in IIa) is traceable to the original Acts of the Synod of 800, which — like the Acts of the CR of 769 — designated the pontiff with this epitheton in conformity with a custom usually observed in all synodal acts. See, for instance, the prima actio of the CR of 798, presided over by Leo III himself (Conc.I.1.203.15): 'Leo, sanctissimus ac ter *beatissimus* . . . universalis papa.' In this connection note that Charlemagne, the *magnus rex* (see I, IIa, VIII), is as such also referred to by Leo III in the same Acts of 798 (p. 203.21.33.37; 204.10).

The repetitious enumeration of the participants in Parts I, II, IV, VIII, XI by no means constitutes a special rhetorical emphasis; it is indicative of the style of synodal acts. Compare Part IV, 'Qui *universi* . . . *episcopi* . . . *dixerunt*,' with the CR of 769 (Conc.I.1.83.11), '*Universi* venerabiles *episcopi dixerunt*;' also Concilium Matisconense of 585,[15] for instance, '*Universi episcopi dixerunt*.' The phrase belongs to the technical expressions of

[14] Cf. von Heckel (above note 12) p. 404, also the Acts of the Roman Synod of 826, MGH Capitularia I.1 (Hannover 1883) No. 180 p. 370 f.

[15] MGH Concilia Aevi Merovingici ed. F. Maassen (Hannover 1893) 164.25.

synodal acts; see the many examples [16] in the Acts of the Oecumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

The characterization of the apostolic see in V, 'quae est *capud omnium Dei ecclesiarum*,' is paralleled in the prima actio of the CR of 769 (Conc. I.1.82.28), where the participants in the sessions of the synod are addressed as 'membra (huius) sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae, que *capud* et principatum *omnium Dei ecclesiarum* existit.' The phrase is further found in the tertia actio of the CR of 798 (Conc.I.1.204–23), at which Leo III presided: 'Venerantes procul dubio sanctae catholicae et apostolicae ecclesiae, quae est *caput ecclesiarum Dei*.' The phrase frequently occurs in the acts of oecumenical councils; see Gesta Chalcedone (ACOE II.iii.1 [1935] 40.5): 'Beatissimi atque apostolici viri papae urbis Romae, quae est *caput omnium ecclesiarum*.'

A significant parallel between the Acts of 800 and those of the CR of 769 occurs in Part X, which offers the genuine oath of innocence of Leo III by which he vindicated himself before the synod.[17] The formula used in the oath, 'quia de . . . scientiam non habeo,' also occurs in the statement of Pope Stephen III concerning his lack of knowledge of certain facts investigated during the prima actio of the CR of 769 (see below).

Our division of the text above into twelve parts helps us recognize the formal structure of the original Acts of the CR of December 800 as preserved in the report of the LP. The vestiges that are typical of synodal acts are printed in italics, and those parts that may well constitute verbatim excerpts from the actiones of the synod are set off by indentation. In order to recognize the style of the Gesta preserved in our text, we may compare it with some of the Latin versions of the Gesta of the Oecumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon,[18] and also with the Acts of the Roman Synods dealing with Symmachus from 499 to 502 during the reign of Theodoric the Great.

[16] See Eduard Schwartz, Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum I.ii (Berlin-Leipzig 1925–6), II.ii.1–2 (1936–7), III.iii.1–3 (1935–7). Subsequently always referred to as ACOE.

[17] See above note 11.

[18] Cf. ACOE I.iii.52,17 ff., 99,1 ff., 119 f., etc.; II.ii.2.17,32 ff., II.iii.1.27 ff., 196 ff.; on the Symmachian councils see ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH Auct. Antt. XIII (Berlin 1894) 399–455. The 'Diplomatics' of synodal acts is still to be written. Von Heckel and Barion (see above note 12) have made a start.

II

Since the report of the LP of the Roman Synod of December 800 is based on the lost acts of this assembly, it may be looked upon as an addition to Albert Werminghoff's Concilia Aevi Karolini I.1 (1904) where it should replace No. 26, the forged oath of purgation, erroneously ascribed to Leo III.

The Synod of December 800, though held at Rome, was not a Roman synod in the usual meaning of the word, because it had not been convoked by the incumbent pope; it met upon the command of Charlemagne, the head of the Frankish national church. Nor did the pope preside; the Frankish king held the chair. The basic Frankish character of the meeting is clearly noticeable in the report of the LP: the mention of the 'magnus rex' seems to have preceded that of the 'beatissimus pontifex' in the synodal acts (see above); in like fashion the Franci are mentioned (in I, IIb, VIII) before the Roman nobility. Thus the synod was actually in origin and guidance a Frankish synod,[19] though the majority of the active participants doubtless was of non-Frankish provenience. We know that the synod was in session from December 1st until the 23rd or 25th, but the number of actiones that were required to transact its order of business is unknown. The original synodal acts with the signatures of the participants in the sessions would have been of the most decisive importance for the solution of several vexing questions. As it is, we must be satisfied with the use made of them in the report of the LP, which outranks in importance the Annales Laureshamenses and the official Annales regni Francorum, so far as the reconstruction of the historical events preceding the coronation of Charlemagne is concerned. Though the Vita Leonis of the LP was not written before 816 (see above our Par. I), the close resemblance of our report to the original Acts of the Synod of December 800 justifies the conclusion that the information which the report contains stands closer to the events than that of any of the

[19] Caspar, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 54 (1935) 226 f. recognized this fact. The censures of Caspar's statement by Adelson-Baker, 'The oath of purgation of Pope Leo III,' Traditio 8 (1952) 61 f. are disproved by our investigation, also their denial of the synod's judicial significance (pp. 62, 67).

Frankish annals, and for this reason offers a better official picture than even the official Frankish imperial annals. Taking into account the observation of Ganshof [20] that the writing of official documents received special care and encouragement under Charlemagne, one may readily assume that there might well have existed at one time — in addition to the official acts of the synod — some official Frankish account of the discussions and decisions of the synod, in which the Franks were so greatly interested. But not a trace of these 'official protocols' — the designation suggested by Heinrich Fichtenau — has, as far as we at present know, survived, and nothing of its contents is observable, as was pointed out above, in the Annales Laureshamenses. To sum up, Halphen's original estimate of the primary position of the report of the LP for the reconstruction of the events preceding the coronation is confirmed by our findings, and Döllinger's condemnation [21] of the partiality of the LP must be somewhat restricted so far as concerns our report.

The report in the LP obviously contains a very small fragment of the original acts of the synod that was in session for more than three weeks. Taking into consideration the controversial and complex main issue of its agenda, we may conclude that the original acts together with the supporting documents, which were read before the assembly in the course of the debates, must have formed a sizeable volume consisting of numerous documents. One of these documents read by a notary into the record during one of the earlier sessions of the proceedings undoubtedly was the Frankish placitum describing the investigation of the charges of Leo's accusers that had been conducted by Frankish missi in December 799 at Rome.[22] In addition the lost acts must have contained depositions of the charges made against Leo, submitted by the attackers and the attacked; also statements by witnesses who testified for Leo; and in all probability also some of the letters by which Charlemagne summoned members of his episcopate to participate in the meeting. In order to gain some idea of the varied

[20] F. L. Ganshof, 'Charlemagne et l'usage de l'écrit en matière administrative,' Le Moyen Age 57 (1951) 1–25.

[21] J. von Döllinger, 'Das Kaisertum Karls des Grossen,' Münchner Historisches Jahrbuch (1865) 332 f.

[22] See Traditio 11 (1955) 39f.

nature of this collection of documents included in the original acts of the synod, one has only to look, for instance, at the extant Acts of the Synod of Frankfurt of June 794 (Conc.I.1.110–171) with their supporting documents, that is, the letters of the accused party, of the incumbent pope, and of Charlemagne, the synodal report of the Frankish episcopate written by Alcuin,[23] the synodica composed by Paulinus of Aquileia for the Italian episcopate, and the official Frankish capitulary, which also embodies the decisions of a Frankish Diet simultaneously held with the synodal meeting.

What we have thus far found warrants basing the reconstruction of the events preceding Charlemagne's coronation primarily on the report in the LP. In this process of reconstruction, the Frankish annals should serve only as secondary and supplementary sources, provided that their information fits — mutatis mutandis — into the procedural course of an accusatory trial conducted before a synodal meeting. That this may have been the modus procedendi of the Synod of December 800 may be assumed, since Eduard Schwartz [24] and Artur Steinwenter [25] have shown for earlier synods the reception by the Church of the procedures of the Roman accusatory trial. If this recognition is applied to the Synod of 800, we must assume that it conducted at first a one-sided court action solely placed on the plaintiffs, who presented their accusations against Leo. These charges were the main topic of the synod which the pope attended, but not as a person being formally on trial. We remember that at the opening he was seated with the Frankish king who officially presided over the meeting, as though it were a meeting of the national Frankish Church. In accordance with Roman Law, the proof of the accusations levelled against the pope rested with the plaintiffs.[26] The synod which was to investigate and to judge these charges denies its own competence in the case and declares unanimously:

[23] See Wallach, 'Charlemagne and Alcuin: Diplomatic Studies in Carolingian Epistolography,' Traditio 9 (1953) 129–140.

[24] 'Der Prozess des Eutyches,' SB. Bayerische Akademie (1929 H.5) 66; see Plöchl (below note 40) p. 228 f.

[25] 'Der antike kirchliche Rechtsgang und seine Quellen,' Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanon. Abt. 23 (1934) 114.

[26] Cf. Steinwenter, p. 73; Rhaban Haacke in Das Konzil von Chalkedon 2 (Würzburg 1953) 96–98; Digest 22.3.2 ei incumbit probatio qui dicit non qui negat.

'We do not dare to judge the Apostolic See which is the head of all the churches of God. For all of us are judged by it (scil. the Apostolic See) and its vicar; it (scil. the Apostolic See) however is judged by nobody as it is the custom from ancient times. But as the highest pontiff will have decided (in the case of the accusations levelled against himself) we shall obey canonically.'

The synodal assembly bases its refusal to sit in judgment over the pope on the principle of the jurisdictional immunity of the pontiff, 'prima sedes a nemine iudicatur;'[27] simultaneously it suggests that Leo should be his own judge. The adoption of the older doctrine of the judicial exemption of the pope has been stressed in many treatments of the pre-coronation events. But scant attention has been paid to the second principle propounded, namely, that the pope himself should judge his own case (Sed sicut ipse summus pontifex censuerit, canonice obediemus).[28] Both principles applied by the synod are adaptations of doctrines developed by the apologetic literature that originated as an aftermath of the synodal trial of Pope Symmachus (498–514) in his conflict with the anti-pope Laurentius (498–ca. 505).[29] By inventing trials of popes preceding Symmachus, his age exercised pseudo-historical criticism on the outcome of the trial of Symmachus. These apocrypha are connected with the names of the popes Sylvester, Marcellinus, Liberius, and Sixtus III. Thus we read the first principle in the Constitutum Silvestri, c. 3 (PL 8.833D):

Et non damnabitur praesul nisi septuaginta duobus, neque praesul summus a quoquam iudicabitur, quoniam his scriptum est: Non est discipulus super magistrum (Matth. 10.24); and (PL 8.840D):
Nemo enim judicabit primam sedem, quoniam omnes sedes a prima sede iustitiam desiderant temperari. Neque ab Augusto, neque ab

[27] Cf. A. Koeniger, 'Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur,' in Festgabe für Albert Ehrhard (Bonn-Leipzig 1922) 273–400.

[28] The assumptions of Adelson-Baker, Traditio 8 (1952) 68 that 'In the LP Leo is cited as making the suggestion' to swear 'voluntarily' an oath, misinterpret this passage; nor did Leo undertake the task on his own as is stated on p. 75. The pope clearly followed a suggestion made by the synod. See F. L. Ganshof, Histoire du Moyen Age 1 (Paris 1928) 455.

[29] See on this literature Erich Caspar, Geschichte des Papsttums 2 (Tübingen 1933) 107–110.

omni clero, neque a regibus, neque a populo iudex judicabitur. . . . Et fixit canonem hunc Silvester episcopus in urbe Roma . . . .

In the Acts of the pseudo-Synod of Sinuessa (Mansi I.1257), which tried Pope Marcellinus (296–304), we read:

Nemo enim unquam judicavit pontificem, nec praesul sacerdotem suum, quoniam prima sedes non iudicabitur a quoquam.

The second principle of the Synod of 800, namely, that the pope should be his own judge, also appears in the Synod of Sinuessa (Mansi I.1255A). Marcellinus is told: 'Tuo ore judica causam tuam et non nostro judicio solve conditionem.'

In the Gesta purgationis of Sixtus III (432–440) Emperor Valentinian III suggests that the pope himself ought to judge his own case (Mansi V.1063): 'et dedit in arbitrio . . . iudicare iudicium suum.'

The acceptance by the synod of these two basic principles is hardly accidental. It reveals the great influence wielded by the Saxon Alcuin on the course of the Roman events preceding the coronation. Before Charlemagne came to Rome on 24 November 800, he had visited Alcuin at Tours.[30] Shortly afterwards Alcuin thanked the king for an invitation to come to Rome; the infirmities of old age prevented him from accepting.[31] Alcuin's ideas of Leo III and the Roman question were however well presented at the synod [32] by his friends Arno of Salzburg, Theodulph of Orléans, Riculf of Mayence, and the Saxons Witto and Fredugis. It might well be that the work of these men whom Ganshof calls 'imperialist clerics' resulted in the acceptance by the synod of the principle of the judicial immunity of the pope. For this was the formula recommended by Alcuin for the solution of the embarrassing Roman problem. In the well-known letter No. 179 of August 799, he wrote to Arno of Salzburg:

Memini me legisse quondam, si rite recordor, *in canonibus beati Silvestri*, non minus septuaginta duobus pontificem accusandum esse et iudicio presentari; et ut illorum talis vita esset, ut potuissent contra talem auc-

[30] Cf. Abel-Simson (above note 1) 211 note 4.
[31] See Alcuin's Epist. 177.
[32] So also A. Kleinclausz, Alcuin (Paris 1948), 258.

toritatem stare. Insuper *et in aliis* legebam *canonibus* apostolicam sedem iudiciariam esse, non iudicandam.

Alcuin here refers to the same forged canonical sources that about sixteen months later formed the basis of the synodal refusal to judge Leo: the Constitutum Silvestri and the Synod of Sinuessa. Alcuin's leadership of the Frankish episcopate at the Synod of December 800 becomes evident in the influence of his friends who participated in the synodal decisions. This expression of Alcuin's personal influence on the events preceding the coronation is paralleled by the important rôle played by Alcuin in 794 at the Synod of Frankfurt — as the author [33] of the Frankish synodica against the heresy of adoptionism, and as the author of Charlemagne's letter to the Spanish clergy informing them of the decisions of the assembly. Alcuin attached great importance to the 'conventus' of December 800. In a letter to Arno of Salzburg (MGH, Epistolae IV, Ep. 218), who had attended the meeting, Alcuin eagerly requested information on the final decisions of 'such a great and illustrious synod' dealing with the affairs of the Church. He believed that the transactions of the gathering that was in session for such an extended period of time must have been of great significance to the Christian people.

The further development of the synodal proceedings according to the report of the LP finally implies that Leo declared his willingness to vindicate himself as some of his predecessors had done before him in the case of false accusations. He met the refusal of the synod to judge him by making a public statement of innocence before the assembly:

'*Quia de* istis criminibus falsis, quibus super me imposuerunt Romani, qui inique me persecuti sunt, *scientiam non habeo*, nec talia egisse me cognosco.'

This is the genuine oath by which Leo III vindicated himself publicly, as we have recently shown.[34] Leo never gave an 'oath of purgation'; the oath of purgation ascribed to him since the ninth century is a forgery.

[33] See above note 23.

[34] See Luitpold Wallach, 'The genuine and the forged oath of Pope Leo III,' Traditio 11 (1955) 37–63. The opening sentence of the forged oath is modelled on Genesis 45.16 Auditum est et celebri sermone vulgatum.

That Leo's statement of innocence is an actual element of the original Acts of the Synod of 800 is supported by the occurrence of the formula 'quia de . . . . scientiam non habeo' [35] in the Acts of the Roman Synod of 769, when the deposed Constantinus II stood trial before a synodal court as a usurper of the papal see. Pope Stephen III who had called together, and presided over, this Concilium Romanum, stated in the prima actio of the meeting his lack of knowledge of the happenings that led to the election of the accused usurper. We read in the acts: [36] 'Sanctissimus ac ter beatissimus Stephanus summus pontifex et universalis papa dixit:

Ego *de* hac causa *nullam habeo scientiam quia* . . .' .

There remains the problem of the identity of the predecessors after whose example Leo cleared himself of the charges made against him. Was he thinking of Stephen III? He might have thought of certain popes of whom the Liber Pontificalis [37] reports 'purgation' (*purgatur*) as a means of denying criminal charges: Damasus I, Sixtus III, Symmachus, and Pelagius I. But in none of these cases do we know for certain that the 'purgation' consisted in the swearing of an oath.

[35] The occurrence of *scientiam habere* in statements of innocence made by two popes is reminiscent of scientia as understood in Roman law, that is the knowledge a person has of certain facts. *Scientiam habere* is found, for instance, in Justinian's Digesta 37.1.10 and 14.4.1,3, but each time in a context different from our two cases. The assumption, however, that two popes actually expressed their innocence through a term of Roman law, at first appears to be untenable in view of the generally accepted fact that the Digest was unknown in the Latin West from the beginning of the seventh to the late eleventh century. The question whether an exception from this opinio communis might not be probable, as far as Italy is concerned, must remain undecided at present, although abridgments of Justinian's Code, the Institutes, and Novels, were extant in Italy during the periods in question. In addition, the Ducate with Rome (as also the Exarchy of Ravenna, Southern Italy, and Sicily) were in 769 nominally still under the rule of the Emperor at Byzantium, and therefore Justinian law was presumably the valid law of the territory.

[36] Conc.I.1.82.9–13. The Synod of 769 is referred to by Nicholas I in a letter of 23 October 867, addressed to Hincmar of Reims and the Frankish episcopate, as the example of a Frankish synod held at Rome; see MGH, Epistolae VI (Karolini Aevi IV, Berlin 1925) 607. But even the official participation of Frankish representatives did not make the meeting of 769 a synod of the Frankish Church. Nicholas was only trying to entice the recalcitrant Frankish clerics to attend a Roman Synod planned by him.

[37] Cf. MGH Gesta Pontificum, ed. Th. Mommsen (Berlin 1898) Nos. 39, p. 84; 46, p. 96; 53, p. 121; for Pelagius see LP I 303.

The case of Pelagius cannot be called a precedent for Leo's oath. The description of the rite used in this instance (LP I 303) — walking up to the ambo and carrying the Gospels — probably influenced the wording in the Vita Leonis (LP II 7). This merely literary connection does not at all warrant a conclusion on the nature of the statement made by Pelagius, who — to be sure — did not swear an oath.[38]

Nor can the trial of Symmachus in 501 [39] be considered a precedent for Leo's case. Symmachus was tried by a synod in an accusatory trial with a libellus accusatorius properly listing the charges of his accusers. Leo, however, was never officially indicted per accusationem, nor was he officially tried by the synod. The acts of the trial of Symmachus may nevertheless be studied to advantage by the student interested in our problem, since they unfold the judicial machinery of a trial before a synod.

There never was a formal trial of Leo by the synod, nor an official indictment. His oath of innocence was given *within* the framework of a synodal meeting that conducted an accusatory trial [40] of his accusers. Nevertheless the statement through which he cleared himself before the synodal assembly is not exactly an extrajudicial oath. His oath was a part of synodal transactions and therefore possessed some judicial quality, because the public proceedings of every synod have a certain judicial significance.[41] This basic nature of synodal decisions was not unknown to Charlemagne and his entourage: the Capitularies incessantly demand their observation holding out severe punishment to transgressors. Though it is true that Leo's oath of innocence was not

[38] Edgar Loening, Das Kirchenrecht im Reiche der Merowinger (Strassburg 1878) 499 note 1; the conclusions of Adelson-Baker, Traditio 8 (1952) 66 f. based on the assumption that Pelagius swore an oath are untenable.

[39] Cf. Erich Caspar, 'Das Verfahren gegen Leo III. Dezember 800,' Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 54 (1935) 255–257, who points out the distinctions between the trial of Symmachus and Leo's case.

[40] Cf. Willibald M. Plöchl, Geschichte des Kirchenrechts I (Wien-München 1953) 228 f.: 'Im Gerichtsverfahren galt grundsätzlich der Akkusations-Prozess, ein Prinzip, das aus dem römischen Recht übernommen wurde. . . . Der Prozess selbst lehnte sich an das römisch-rechtliche Verfahren an . . . Der römisch-rechtliche Prozess wurde als das subsidiäre Recht im kirchlichen Gerichtsverfahren angesehen;' see also p. 381, and above notes 24, 25, and 26.

[41] Cf. Plöchl, op. cit., I.134 ff., 297–299; and Hans Erich Feine, Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte I (Weimar 1954) 49 f. See above note 19.

the result of a formal judicial decision, the judicial nature of the oath cannot be denied. At this point it might be helpful to remember that an oath has a greater authority than a judgment according to the Digest 12.2.2, though we must keep in mind what has been stated in our Note 35 (above) on the disputed knowledge of the Digest in the Latin West.

The presence of Charlemagne, the highest Frankish judge, who had convoked the synod, and — though the pope was present — nevertheless presided at the opening, again testifies to the judicial nature of the synodal proceedings. But this position then occupied by the Frankish king was not unusual. Already in 794 he had convoked the Synod of Frankfurt[42] (simultaneously held with a Frankish Diet), which condemned the heresy of Spanish adoptionism, and the Byzantine worship of images, which had been decreed in 787 by the Seventh Oecumenical Council held at Nicaea. At Frankfurt Charlemagne presided, and not the two papal legates of Pope Hadrian I who were present. Quite significantly, the king also participated in the debates of the synod which he opened. After the reading — upon royal request — of a letter by Elipand of Toledo concerning the adoptionist theories, Charlemagne rose from the sella regia and addressed the assembly at length (prolixo sermone) on the theological question.[43] And then Charlemagne actively participated in the synodal decisions which, for this reason, are introduced in the Frankfurt Capitulary (Conc.I.1 No.19G) cc. 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16, with the words 'decreed by the Lord King and the Holy Synod,' 'definitum (or statutum) est a domno rege et sancta synodo.' This participation of Charlemagne in the decisions of the Frankfurt Synod plainly indicates the judicial character of its proceedings. We doubt that the Frankish King actually voted with the episcopate on the various issues under debate. He certainly had more than merely a vote at the meetings: his was the decisive voice, and the assembly complied with

[42] See above note 23.

[43] Conc.I.1.131, quoted by Paulinus of Aquileia in the report he wrote against adoptionism in the name of the Italian episcopate assembled at Frankfurt: 'Quid vobis videtur? Ab anno prorsus praeterito et ex quo coepit huius pestis insania tumescente perfidiae ulcu diffusius ebulisse, non parvus in his regionibus, licet in extremis finibus regni nostri, error inolevit, quem censura fidaei necesse est modis omnibus resecare.' This is the only extant literal fragment of any of the many speeches delivered by Charlemagne.

his wishes. Thus we read in the Capitulary of Frankfurt cc. 55–56: 'Dixit enim domnus rex — omnis synodus consensit;' and 'Commonuit (scil. Charlemagne) etiam — omnis namque synodus secundum ammonitionem domni regis consensit.'

A similar procedure can be safely assumed for Charlemagne at the Roman Synod of December 800. At Rome Charlemagne's position largely resembled that of Roman emperors [44] who not only claimed the exclusive right to convoke councils, but also participated in the debates of the meetings, although they did not vote with the assembled episcopate on the synodal decisions.

Charlemagne doubtless determined the proceedings and the course taken by the Synod of December 800, since we know that his relentless leadership imposed itself so strongly on the affairs of the Church. This was true even in the case of those Frankish synods which he did not attend, yet whose acts were submitted to him for approval and support.[45] How much more must he have exerted his will on a synod over which he personally presided! The prerogatives of Charlemagne as the head of his own national church were openly recognized and acknowledged by Frankish synods. The Synod of Tours, 813, for instance, could unabashedly express at the end of the official gesta its willingness to submit the acts to the approval of, and the possible changes suggested by, Charlemagne — 'quomodo deinceps piissimo principi nostro de his agendum placebit' (Conc.I.1.293); the assembly openly states that it is ready to act in accordance with the king's nod and wish — 'ad nutum et voluntatem eius parati sumus.' A recent [46] portrait of the pious Charlemagne in the service of the Church neglects to state that Charlemagne unreservedly used and governed the institutions of the Church for the advancement of his secular government.

The official Frankish report of the events in the Annales regni Francorum (ArF) and the narrative of the Annales Laureshа-

[44] Cf. generally Francis Dvornik, 'Emperor, popes, and general councils,' Dumbarton Oaks Papers 6 (1951) 1–23; Hans Barion, Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters (Bonn-Köln 1931) passim.

[45] Cf. Karl Voigt, Staat und Kirche von Konstantin dem Grossen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit (Stuttgart 1936) 321.

[46] Étienne Delaruelle, 'Charlemagne et l'Église,' Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France 39 (1953) 166–199.

menses (AL) are compatible with the present interpretation of the papal report. At the outset, neither of these sources speaks of a formal trial of Leo III by the Synod of December 800. Not the pope, but his accusers stood before the synod which interrogated them about the criminal charges brought forth against the pontiff. In the course of this examination, which — in accordance with the custom observed in the proceedings of synods — was conducted in all likelihood by the leading metropolitan present, and not by Charlemagne,[47] the king recognized that the motive of the accusers was not justice, but envy or hatred of the pope (AL: . . . cum cognovisset rex, quia non propter aliam justitiam sed per invidiam eum condemnare volebant, tunc . . .). Thus the evidence offered by the accusers against Leo was deemed insufficient. The accusers could not make their case, or as the official ArF puts it: 'nullus probator criminum esse voluit.' At this juncture the synod decided to invoke the doctrine of the judicial exemption of the pope; simultaneously it suggested that it would abide by Leo's own decision of the case, or in other words: Leo was told to be his own judge. The same decision of the synod is reported in the AL: 'non tamen per eorum iudicium,' and the pope agreed to vindicate himself before the synod after the example of earlier pontiffs. Contrary to the advice Alcuin had given to Arno of Salzburg, Leo at another session of the synod gave an oath stating:

'Since I have no knowledge of these untrue charges which the Romans, who unjustly persecute me, have laid on me, I acknowledge that I have not committed the like.'

This solution of the embarrassing problem actually meant a partial victory of Leo's enemies who had expected his resignation without an oath. Alcuin [48] had learned of their plans against Leo from the overtures they made to Charlemagne during August 799 when the king was at Paderborn. To achieve the deposition [49]

[47] Adelson-Baker, Traditio 8 (1952) 62 maintain that Charlemagne himself 'questioned' the assailants of the pope; none of the sources warrants this assumption which, in addition, is contradicted by the above mentioned synodal procedures.

[48] Epistle 179, addressed to Arno of Salzburg.

[49] That the deposition of Leo was requested by his enemies is also known from the Annales regni Francorum ad a. 801 where we read of those who had deposed the pontiff in 800: 'eos qui pontificem anno superiore deposuerunt.'

of the pope they had openly charged him with adultery and perjury. These charges were supposed to elicit from Leo a very heavy oath for the purpose of clearing himself of falsely attributed crimes. Contrary to expectation, these 'enviers' (aemulatores) of Leo — as Alcuin called them — did not succeed in gaining the support of Charlemagne in their conspiratorial machinations. During the investigation of their charges by the synod the Frankish king very acutely recognized that they were motivated by envy, not by justice.

Conclusion

The original Acts of the Roman Synod of December 800 were used in the Liber Pontificalis. The report of the meeting in the Vita Leonis must be looked upon as a primary historical source for the reconstruction of the important events preceding the recognition of Charlemagne as Emperor on Christmas Day 800. The accounts of the official Frankish and papal reports of the synod do not contradict one another. The synod investigated the charges of the accusers of Leo III, who was never indicted nor tried by the assembly which he personally attended. Properly speaking, a public trial [50] of Leo never took place. The pope's condemnation by synodal decision was hardly intended by Charlemagne.[51] The synod suggested to the pontiff that he be his own judge. Thereupon Leo cleared himself by swearing an oath of innocence during a session of the synod on December 23; two days later Charlemagne was recognized [52] and acclaimed as Emperor of the Romans.

[50] Walter Ullmann, The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages (London, 1955), 97 and 117 f., still speaks — like other historians before him — of Leo's 'trial,' and maintains that Charlemagne sat in judgment over the pope. Neither of these contentions is borne out by the sources.

[51] So also Johannes Haller, Das Papsttum 2 (Stuttgart, 1951) 18 f.

[52] See Percy Ernst Schramm, 'Die Anerkennung Karls des Grossen als Kaiser,' Historische Zeitschrift 172 (1951), especially p. 488.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. *Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube* . . . in honour of Charles Harold Dodd . . . Cambridge, At the University Press, 1956. xviii, 554 p. front. (port.)

Bar-Mitzvah, For Boyhood, Youth and Manhood (Revised Edition). *By H. Pereira Mendes* . . . New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1956. xvii, 98 p.

Critique of Practical Reason. [*By*] *Immanuel Kant.* Translated, with an introduction, *by Lewis White Beck* . . . New York, The Liberal Arts Press, [1956]. xix, 168 p. (The Library of Liberal Arts, no. 52)

De Errore Profanarum Religionum, *Iuli Firmici Materni.* Introduzione e commento *a cura di Agostino Pastorino.* Firenze, "La Nuova Italia" Editrice [1956]. lxxvi, 294 p. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, 27)

The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920–1940. [*By*] *Paul A. Carter* . . . Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press [1956]. x, 265 p.

Delinquent Saints; Disciplinary Action in the Early Congregational Churches of Massachusetts. *By Emil Oberholzer, Jr.* New York, Columbia University Press, 1956. x, 379 p. (Columbia Studies in the Social Sciences, 590)

Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia (1075–1953). Collegit introductione et adnotationibus *auxit P. Athanasius G Welykyj.* . . Romae, PP. Basiliani, Sumptibus Ucrainorum apud Exteros Gegentium, 1953–1954. 2 v. (Analecta OSBM. Series II. Sectio III. Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Unitae in Terris Ucrainae et Belorussiae)

Faith, Reason, and Existence; An Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy of Religion. [*By*] *John A. Hutchison.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1956. 306 p.

The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought. *By John Baillie.* New York, Columbia University Press, 1956. 151 p.

Imprudence in St. Thomas Aquinas. *By Charles J. O'Neil.* . . Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1955. 165 p. (The Aquinas Lecture, 1955)

The Inspiration of Scripture: a Study of the Theology of the 17th Century Lutheran Dogmaticians. *By Robert Preus.* . . Mankato, Minnesota, Lutheran Synod Book Company [1955]. xix, 216 p.

Ishmael. [*By*] *James Baird.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956. xxviii, 445 p.

John Dewey's Thought and Its Implications for Christian Education. [*By*] *Manford George Gutzke.* New York, King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1956. xv, 270 p.

Kyrkohistorisk Aarsskrift, Uitgiven av Svenska Kyrkohistoriska Foereningen, *genom Gunnar Westin.* Femtiofemte aargaangen, 1955. Uppsala och Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1955. 344 p.

Merveilleux Metapsychique et Miracle Chretien. *Par le R. P. De Tonquedec, S.J.* Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1955. 133 p. (Centre d'Etudes Laennec)

THE NEW TESTAMENT & RABBINIC JUDAISM. *By David Daube.* . . [London] University of London, Athlone Press, 1956. xviii, 460 p. (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion, 2)

THE OFFICIAL PRIESTS OF ROME UNDER THE JULIO-CLAUDIANS; a Study of the Nobility from 44 B.C. to 68 A.D. [*By*] *Martha W. Hoffman Lewis.* . . [Rome] American Academy in Rome, 1955. 186 p. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Volume XVI.)

PSYCHO-PATHOLOGIE DE L'ANTI-CONCEPTION. *Par Charles Mertens de Wilmars.* . . Travail couronne par le Prix "Jean XXI" 1954. Paris, 1954. 107 p. (Centre d'Etudes Laennec)

RABBINISCHER INDEX, *Herausgegeben von Joachim Jeremias. Bearbeitet von Kurt Adolph.* Muenchen, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956. xi, 101 p. (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch *von Hermann L. Strack und Paul Billerbeck*, Fuenfter Band.)

RECENT DISCOVERIES IN BIBLE LANDS. *By William Foxwell Albright.* . . New York. Published by The Biblical Colloquium, by special arrangement with Funk & Wagnalls Company [1955] 136 p.

LA RELIGION ROMAINE A L'APOGEE DE L'EMPIRE. I. LA POLITIQUE RELIGIEUSE DES ANTONINS (96–192), [*par*] *Jean Beaujeu.* Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1955. 452 p. plates. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.)

RITES OF THE STATE RELIGION IN ROMAN ART. [*By*] *Inez Scott Ryberg.* Rome, American Academy in Rome, 1955. xvi, 227 p. 67 plates. (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. XXII, 1955)

S. JOSAPHAT, HIEROMARTYR; Documenta Romana Beatificationis et Canonizationis. Vol. II. 1628–1637. Collegit adnotationibus illustravit nec non introductione *auxit P. Athanasius G. Welykyj OSBM.* Romae, PP. Basiliani, 1955. 368 p. ports. illus. "Anleett OSBM" Series II. Sectio III: Documenta Romana Ecclesiae Catholicae in Terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae — Bio — et Hagiographica)

S. THOMAE DE AQVINO Ordinis Praedicatorum SVMMA THEOLOGIAE *Cura et Studio Instituti Studiorum Medievalium Ottaviensis* ad textum S. Pii Pp. V. iussu, confectum recognita. Tomvs Tertivs, complectens Secvndam Secvndae. Editio Altera emendata. Ottawa, Canada, Edidit Commissio Piana, 1953. xlviii, 1401a–2412b, 28 p.

LES SAINTS "PAÏENS" DE L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT. [*Par*] *Jean Daniélou.* Paris, Éditions du Seuil [1956]. 172 p.

SENOFANE; Testimonianze e Frammenti. Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento *a cura di Mario Untersteiner.* Firenze, "La Nuova Italia" Editrice [1956]. cclxxx, 153 p. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, 33.)

THEOBALD, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. *By Avrom Saltman.* [London] University of London, The Athlone Press, 1956. xvi, 594 p. front. (University of London Historical Studies, II)

THÉOLOGIE DE L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT. [*Par*] *Edmond Jacob.* Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé [1955]. 287 p. (Manuels et Précis de Théologie)

THOMAS CRANMER, THEOLOGIAN. [*by*] *Geoffrey W. Bromiley.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1956. xxviii, 108 p.